

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

FRANCES PERKINS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU - Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief

CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN IN A DEMOCRACY

PAPERS AND DISCUSSIONS AT THE INITIAL SESSION

Held in Washington, D. C.

April 26, 1939



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1940



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/conferenceonchil00whit_1

Contents

	Page
Foreword, by Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor-----	IV
The background and purposes of the conference, by Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief, Children's Bureau-----	V
MORNING SESSION	
Address by the President of the United States-----	2
The responsibility of a democratic society for the care of children and youth, by Monsignor Keegan, executive director, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York-----	7
The fourth White House conference on children, by Homer Folks, secre- tary, State Charities Aid Association of New York-----	13
Children and the future, by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt-----	20
SECTION MEETINGS	
SECTION 1: Objectives of a democratic society in relation to children—ex- cerpts from discussion -----	24
SECTION 2: Economic foundations of family life and child welfare—ex- cerpts from discussion-----	40
SECTION 3: The development of children and youth in present-day Ameri- can life—excerpts from discussion-----	62
SECTION 4: The child and community services for health, education, and social protection—excerpts from discussion-----	85
DINNER SESSION	
The Chairman, Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor-----	102
Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture-----	103
James S. Plant, M. D-----	105
William Hodson-----	106
Ruth Andrus-----	108
Frank Bane-----	110
Homer Folks-----	113

Foreword

The addresses and informal discussions at the initial session of the fourth White House Conference on children, held in Washington on April 26, are published as working materials for members of the conference during the year in which it will be studying the purposes of our democracy with reference to children and youth and the extent to which these purposes find effective expression in our national life.

Perhaps some people may wonder why we need a White House Conference to express our affectionate concern in the welfare of children. Nowhere, I feel sure, are the interests of children more deeply cherished than in America. Our forefathers came to this Western Hemisphere chiefly for the purpose of founding homes under conditions where their children would be able to enjoy freedom and opportunity for the fullest possible development of their inborn capacities. Our Nation was the first in the world to establish a special agency of the National Government for the service of children.

The conference is not going to attempt to define or defend our American democracy though it may have to attempt to state some of its underlying purposes. Democracy is not only a form of government, it is not only a matter of people living in liberty with each other; there is involved in it the experience of men in liking each other, in getting on together, and in using the friendship so generated to develop a better life and a better relationship for all the people who come after us. We need to take these things for granted in America and go on to see what more we can do with them in behalf of the children of the next generation.

It is our awareness of the importance of centering attention, in the development of our democracy, upon those in the population who are in the most formative and impressionable period of life, namely the children, that leads us to review the extent to which their needs are being met, and the ways in which we may assure to them those safeguards and opportunities upon which their happiness and growth, and the future of America, depend.

FRANCES PERKINS

The Background and Purposes of the Conference

By Katharine F. Lenroot

Plans for the conference were developed as a result of suggestions, coming to the President and to the Department of Labor from many sources, that it was important again to review our goals with reference to children and the extent to which they are being realized in our civilization. Such review, with increasing breadth of approach and coverage, took place in 1909, in 1919, and in 1930. Discussion with individuals and in group meetings led to a conference with the President and a decision to organize a conference that should meet in an initial session this year to define major objectives, and in final session in the spring of 1940. The intervening period is to be devoted to committee work and informal consultation with individuals and groups. It was further decided that the trend of events both in our own Nation and in the world made it necessary to extend the purposes of the conference to include, as the President has stated, "the relationship between a successful democracy and the children who form an integral part of that democracy." The name "Conference on Children in a Democracy" was selected as being in harmony with such an objective.

The President suggested that a planning committee broadly inclusive of the various professions, official agencies, associations, and citizen groups interested in children be appointed to take responsibility for organizing the conference and planning its work. Such a committee, numbering 72 persons, was appointed. Executive responsibility for the conference was placed in the Children's Bureau. The Planning Committee has given notable service in outlining the nature and scope of the conference and making arrangements for the initial session.

Two committees were established by the Planning Committee, a small committee on organization to assist the staff in the development of conference plans, and a larger committee to be responsible for developing a comprehensive report for presentation to the final session of the conference.

Membership in the conference was planned to include a wide range of interest and experience. The Governor of each State and Territory was asked to designate a representative. Other members were appointed by the chairman of the conference after suggestions had been reviewed by the Committee on Organization. Approximately 630 people were invited to become members of the conference. Accept-

ances were received from 585, representing every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Those in attendance at the initial session numbered 410, from every State and Territory included in the membership, with the exception of Idaho, Wyoming, and Alaska.

As plans for the conference developed, it became clear that a program of extensive research was not needed, for information is available from many sources concerning the conditions under which the children of the United States live and the opportunities open to them. What is needed is selection and correlation of this material, using it to paint with a broad brush a picture of the relations of children to a democratic society and the importance of providing for them those things which are essential to their happiness and well-being and to the security and future of the Nation.

To the Report Committee, aided by a small research staff headed by Dr. Philip Klein, has been entrusted the task of assembling and interpreting material, conducting group and individual conferences on various aspects of the subject matter to be included, and preparing a report for submission to individual conference members and later to the final session of the conference.

Dr. Klein, in his remarks to the conference at the General Assembly in the afternoon of April 26, pointed out that one of the most important parts of research is to find the sources of information. He stated that there are two major types of material that will be used by the conference: (1) Opinion and judgment, and (2) factual material. With reference to the first, it will be necessary to obtain much of the information needed by appealing to the members of the conference. With reference to the second, Dr. Klein predicted that the difficulty may be not so much the absence of facts that seem pertinent as selection from an enormous mass of material available and concentration on those things which are of particular value to the conference. He emphasized the importance of public sources, many of them comparatively recent, as constituting by far the most important reservoir of information concerning the general living conditions and life of the people.

The sections into which the conference divided on April 26 were set up for the purpose of preliminary discussion only, and will not be continued. Methods of organizing consultation service from members of the conference, group discussion, and review of drafts of report material will have to be developed as the work progresses under the leadership of the Report Committee and the research staff. It is planned to submit the report to members of the conference some time in advance of the final session, so that all may have a chance to study it, make suggestions, and come to the final conference fully informed concerning the subjects to be considered.

Conference on Children in a Democracy

Called by the Secretary of Labor at the Direction of the President

First Session—April 26, 1939

Morning Session at the White House

Presiding: The Chairman of the Conference, Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor

The CHAIRMAN. This is the fourth of a series of White House Conferences on children held at 10-year intervals since 1909. It was just 30 years ago that the first conference assembled on the call of President Theodore Roosevelt. Other conferences under Presidential auspices were held in 1919 and 1930.

President Roosevelt has been deeply interested in this Conference and has consented to serve as Honorary Chairman. Mr. President, this is your conference and we look to you for guidance in outlining the objectives toward which we should direct our efforts.

Address by the President of the United States

It is, perhaps, because I happened to be born with what may be called a "relative mind" and because I have sought to cultivate that kind of thinking for nearly half a century that I think of this conference in the first instance in terms of the past.

Child welfare—to use a much misused term—did not enter into the public conscience of any nation until about 100 years ago. And we know from reading Dickens and the literature of his period that the well-being of children in those early days was principally considered from the viewpoint of schooling and of crime prevention and the ending of physical cruelty—all interwoven with the sentimentality of the good, the ultra-good, Victorians.

As time went on some interest came to be taken in every nation, but still the activities of those who sought the bettering of the younger generation of the moment viewed the problem before them as a problem somewhat apart from the relationship of the younger generation to the broader public weal.

Even at the time of the first children's conference to assemble in the White House under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909, the conditions that surrounded child life were discussed more in terms of child life than in terms of the national community.

This was true to a very great extent in the two succeeding White House Conferences, and it occurs to me that this, the fourth conference, marks a new and somewhat changed era.

It is still our task to bring to bear upon the major problems of child life all the wisdom and understanding that can be distilled from compilations of facts, from the intuitions of common sense, and from professional skill. This conference, like the others, is composed of men and women having a broad range of experience and interest in matters pertaining to the welfare of children. It is our purpose to review the objectives and methods affecting the safety, well-being, and happiness of the younger generation and their preparation for the responsibilities of citizenship.

But we have gone one step further. Definitely we are here with a principal objective of considering the relationship between a successful democracy and the children who form an integral part of that democracy. We no longer set them apart from democracy as if they were a segregated group. They are at one with democracy because they are dependent upon a democracy and democracy is dependent on them.

Our work will not be concluded at the end of the day—it will only have begun. During the greater part of the coming year the members of this conference, representing every State in the Union and many fields of endeavor, will be at work. We shall be testing our institutions, and our own convictions and attitudes of mind as they affect our actions as parents and as citizens, in terms of their significance to the childhood of our Nation.

In an address on Pan American Day, 2 weeks ago, I said, "Men are not prisoners of fate, but only prisoners of their own minds. They have within themselves the power to become free at any moment." On April 15, in addressing the heads of two great States, I stated that I refused to believe that the world is, of necessity, a prisoner of destiny. "On the contrary," I said, "it is clear that the leaders of great nations have it in their power to liberate their people from the disaster that impends. It is equally clear that in their own minds and in their own hearts the peoples themselves desire that their fears be ended."

In providing for the health and education of children, for the formation of their minds and characters in ways which are in harmony with the institutions of a free society, democracy is training its future leaders. The safety of democracy therefore depends upon the widespread diffusion of opportunities for developing those qualities of mind and character which are essential to leadership in our modern age. Further, democracy is concerned not only with preparation for leadership, but also with preparation for the discharge of the duties of citizenship in the determination of general policies and the selection of those persons who are to be entrusted with special duties. Beyond this, democracy must inculcate in its children capacities for living and assure opportunities for the fulfillment of those capacities. The success of democratic institutions is measured, not by extent of territory, financial power, machines or armaments, but by the desires, the hopes, and the deep-lying satisfactions of the individual men, women, and children who make up its citizenship.

We shall be concerned with ways in which the broad chasm between knowing and doing may be bridged over. We shall be reminding ourselves that all the lectures on nutrition will avail nothing unless there is food for a child to eat; that a law for compulsory school attendance is one thing and a chance to go to school is another. Prenatal instruction cannot assure healthy babies unless the mother has access to good medical and nursing care when the time for the baby's arrival is at hand. We know how to budget a family's expenditures. We have undertaken to preserve home life for fatherless or motherless children through the joint effort of the Federal Government and the States. We have made great progress in the application of money and service to the promotion of maternal and child health; the restoration

of crippled children to normal physical condition; the protection of neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent, especially in rural areas; and the elimination of child labor from industries shipping goods in interstate commerce.

Yet after all has been said only a beginning has been made in affording security to children. In many parts of the country we have not provided enough to meet the minimum needs of dependent children for food, shelter, and clothing, and the Federal Government's contribution toward their care is less generous than its contribution to the care of the aged.

It is not enough, however, to consider what a democratic society must provide. We must look at our civilization through the eyes of children. If we can state in simple language some of the basic necessities of childhood, we shall see more clearly the issues which challenge our intelligence.

We make the assumption that a happy child should live in a home where he will find warmth and food and affection; that his parents will take care of him should he fall ill; that at school he will find the teachers and tools needed for an education; that when he grows up there will be a job for him and that he will some day establish his own home.

As we consider these essentials of a happy childhood our hearts are heavy with the knowledge that there are many children who cannot make these assumptions.

We are concerned about the children of the unemployed.

We are concerned about other children who are without adequate shelter or food or clothing because of the poverty of their parents.

We are concerned about the children of migratory families who have no settled place of abode or normal community relationships.

We are concerned about the children of minority groups in our population who, confronted with discrimination and prejudice, must find it difficult to believe in the just ordering of life or the ability of the adults in their world to deal with life's problems.

We are concerned about the children living beyond the reach of medical service or lacking medical service because their parents cannot pay for it.

We are concerned about the children who are not in school or who attend schools poorly equipped to meet their needs.

We are concerned about the children who are outside the reach of religious influences, and are denied help in attaining faith in an ordered universe and in the fatherhood of God.

We are concerned about the future of our democracy when children cannot make the assumptions that mean security and happiness.

This conference and the activities which it initiates furnish an opportunity for us to test ourselves and our institutions by the extent to which they serve our children. I look to you for comprehensive review of the problems before us, and suggestions as to practical ways in which we may advance toward our goal.

Many branches of the Federal Government are engaged in the promotion of the health, education, and well-being of the Nation's children. You will be asked to consider the points at which these undertakings may be strengthened, and the needs for service which cannot be supplied with the resources at hand. But the attention of this conference must not be directed to Federal activities alone, or even to joint Federal and State undertakings. It is the local community which is the focal point for all these programs. Children receive benefits not in Washington but in the places where they live.

The men and women within the sound of my voice,¹ as well as you who are assembled at the White House, are in the larger sense members of this conference. Recommendations will be brought to us in a final session next year. It then will be for all of us to determine the extent to which they will be translated into action. I bid you, the members of the conference, Godspeed in your high endeavor.

The CHAIRMAN. We might all say to the President, what I think we all feel at this moment, first that he has the really great gift of stirring our country to make us know and understand that we must fulfill that mission which he has described to us; second, that he has pointed out the way in which we can satisfy this stirring of the conscience; and third, that he has expressed for us that undying faith in the possibilities of life in America under the leadership of God. So we are grateful to him for what he has said in these few minutes to start our conference in a direction which we expect to follow throughout the coming year, for you are aware, as I know, and as he has repeated to you, that this is a conference which will last a year. We shall break up, I presume, into subcommittees, which will study intensively certain specific fields with the help of experts in those fields, and we shall meet again early in 1940 to put those findings and recommendations into formal shape, so that we may adopt them or modify them, and develop a program for the work of the people interested in and concerned about children for the next 10 years.

This conference will be concerned with two major questions. First, what are the primary objectives of a democratic society in relation to children. This is a very searching question. I do not think we have ever answered it to ourselves, but the time has come for us to say something about it.

¹ The President's address was broadcast.

Second, to what extent are these objectives being realized, or is there capacity to realize them under present-day conditions in the United States of America—as the President said, not to realize them in pretty words here in Washington, but to realize them in every school district, in every manufacturing town, in every farm area, in every little village, and in every great city, in every tenement home, in every log cabin in which the children of the United States live today.

It is a fact that officials sitting here in the city of Washington tend to forget what the struggles of life are in those remote and far places where people must still eat and sleep and say their prayers and find their way of life. And so it is for you always to keep us reminded of the practical applications of all of the things that we talk about, not in theory, but in hope and in aspiration.

The session this morning, and the section meetings this afternoon, will be devoted to consideration of the major issues raised by these two questions, and how the conference may best proceed to work during the months ahead. Through his profound understanding of the principles underlying democracy, his experience in the administration of the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York, and the position of national leadership in social work which he occupies, our next speaker is eminently qualified to discuss the subject of the responsibility of a democratic society for the care of children and youth.

I present to you, with great pride and affection, my old friend and long-time adviser on many of these problems, the Right Reverend Monsignor Robert F. Keegan.

The Responsibility of a Democratic Society for the Care of Children and Youth

**By the Right Reverend Monsignor Robert F. Keegan, Executive Director,
Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York**

What is the responsibility of a democratic society for the care of children and youth? The answer to this question, in my opinion, is of vital importance not only to our children and youth, but to our democracy itself. Children and youth are precious. Their minds, hands, and hearts will shape the America of tomorrow.

Our democratic society receives its mandate from every man, woman, and child in America. Our citizens are free to form themselves into associations of various kinds, and have the duty through the ballot box of delegating powers to local, State, and Federal government, thus sharing the common responsibility of all for the general welfare.

What do our children and youth face today? Frustration, insecurity, fear, despair, resentment, confusion, lack of opportunity. The responsibility of our democratic society is to marshal every asset, every resource known to man to fortify our children and our youth against the insidious forces in our national life and in the world today, which would regiment them, deprive them of their freedom, deny them equality of opportunity, ruin them morally in body and soul. It is the further responsibility of our democratic society to its children and youth to see to it that the home, the church, and the school teach the fundamental concepts of our democracy—the right of each person to life, liberty, happiness, equality of opportunity, freedom of the press, of religion, of assembly, and of petition.

This conference insofar as it is humanly possible must help to provide for our young people what our American concept of a democratic society in its very charter purports to give to all its people—hope, security, and genuine guarantees in the pursuit of happiness.

It seems to me that the most urgent and salutary message that this conference will give to our children and youth is the straightforward, frank, and courageous statement that we recognize and are sensitive to their needs. We must not let these difficult years rob our young people of hope.

The totalitarian ideologies lure youth to false havens of security. They force upon youth a spurious security in exchange for freedom.

This regimentation of youth across the sea is a sad result of an utter disregard of basic human rights and privileges. Such is not our objective. A properly ordered society should aim to provide for its children and youth the essentials for security without sacrificing freedom. If our children are to be nurtured in a manner consistent with our ideas of democratic society, we must safeguard, defend, and develop the fundamental pillars of a well-ordered civilization—the home, the school, and the church. Upon these rest the welfare, the stability, and the future of our Nation.

A democratic society must be able to set its own house in order. It must be able to achieve an adequate standard of living for all its families, else the well-being of children and youth will be placed in jeopardy.

The foundations of our democratic institutions are the home, the school, and the church. Never must their primacy be assailed.

Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. The home is in fact the very cornerstone of society and the child is the capstone of the home. Any program for children and youth in a democracy must preserve and strengthen home life. Any threat to the home must be considered a challenge which will call for the marshaling of every resource of society to repel it. And the first to respond to this call must be our welfare agencies, private and public, local, State, and Federal, all cooperating in a common effort. This is the American way.

These varied agencies for child welfare must focus on the ultimate goal—to conserve or to rebuild the home—the child's natural environment. When the home collapses the future of the child is gravely endangered. Indeed, it is well-nigh impossible to build a stable society unless the home is what it should be, a fortress within whose walls reign the angels of harmony—mutual respect and mutual love.

Frightful it is to behold the plight of a child pinned under the debris of a shattered home. The termites of selfish living have eaten away the basic structure of many of our American homes. These evils we should unflinchingly face and courageously combat. We must stop the advance in our country of that deadliest of the enemies of the home and society—the demon of divorce.

Where the home has been irrevocably shattered and it is impossible to preserve the natural environment of the child, we should devote ourselves to the intelligent selection of a substitute home in accordance with the highest standards of social work.

To forget the home is to forget the child. To remember always the supreme importance of the home is to set programs for children and youth upon a sure and firm foundation.

To the school have been entrusted many important rights and responsibilities of the parent. In the school the child not only ex-

periences his first contact with society outside the home, but receives a lasting imprint through his formative years. Society, especially a democratic society, must furnish and provide in its schools a foundation in right living for the child. This tremendous responsibility must be broad in its concept, must develop the whole child as an integrated personality geared to the tempo of today. No one side of the child's life should be overdeveloped. No one side should be left undeveloped. Balance is needed in the educational process. The whole child must be developed, his mind formed, and his body strengthened. Not only must his sense faculties be refined and his memory trained, but more important still, his higher spiritual powers of intellect and will must be nurtured.

The aim of education is not to teach our children and youth how to make a living so much as it is to teach them how to live, and how to live harmoniously with others. Character, more than brains and brawn, is the essential for successful living and for an ordered society. To build character, youth must be taught the art of right thinking and the science of self-control.

The educational program, of course, should meet the myriad diversities of the complex life of today. With equal diligence should children and youth be prepared vocationally for the farm, the work-bench, and the office. But the future citizen of this great Nation—on the farm, in the factory, or in the office—must be a completely integrated personality, a properly oriented creature of the Omnipotent God and brother of his fellowman. Man or child cannot do without absolutes, namely, the existence of God, the eternal and immutable principles of right and wrong, and the inherent dignity of man. It is an obligation of educators to teach these absolutes according to the best possible methods that they may enrich, ennable, and give a solid moral foundation to the generation that is to follow.

Educators must get over to our children a fuller appreciation of democracy, what it means to be born in America, the priceless heritage to which they are the heirs, the responsibility that will soon be theirs for preserving our free institutions. Academic freedom has never meant a license for teachers in our schools and colleges to impress on young, immature, and plastic minds subversive doctrines looking to the overthrow of our American form of government. The crime against our youth committed by such tactics is second only to robbing little children of their faith in God. Certainly one of the basic responsibilities of a democratic society is to see to it that our children and youth get a fair, full, and complete statement of the principles upon which this democracy rests.

On January 4 of this year the President of the United States, in his Message to the Congress, said that religion is the source of democracy and international good faith, and that "Religion, by teach-

ing man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbors." Paramount is the responsibility of a democracy to its children in the sphere of religion. For religion is at the very heart of true democracy.

Who is the child that society should be mindful of him? Religion gives us the answer. The child is a person, an individual, an intelligent, free human being. The child is but the bud—the flower is the man. Man's dignity is rooted in God the Creator, and man's destiny is the eternal companionship with God. "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, endowed him with the powerful force of intellect, given him a free will, and energy strong enough to control and adapt many of the powers of nature. Man is the child of God out of whose meditations have sprung philosophies, out of whose dreams have been born the arts and the literature of the ages, from whose labors have arisen pyramids and cathedrals.

If such is man, then such preeminently is the child—for the child is but the bud from which man will flower. Only in religion can child-welfare efforts find their true foundation, for only in religion can be found the inherent and intrinsic dignity of the human personality. Man was not made for the state but for God, and each individual man has a value beyond our conception in the eyes of his Eternal Father.

Religion, therefore, must be a very practical force in a child's life. For if he is not taught the truths of religion in his formative years, he cannot be expected to learn them later when his mode of thinking has been set. Religion must provide the guides and the ideals for right living. It must afford vigorous incentives and inspiring motives for right conduct. It must teach the necessity for Divine assistance in meeting the stresses and strains of life. It must teach the child that from the eternal realities of religion spring the living sources of democracy. In religious principles repose the guarantees of natural rights and freedoms and the proper respect for legitimate authority.

I am impelled here to speak of the abuse of one of our fundamental freedoms, the freedom of the press. I consider it a major danger to our children and our youth that this democracy permits an output of foul magazines, salacious pictures, and perverted literature to continue year after year unchecked. This indecent literature is making a frightful assault on the morality of our children and our youth. Freedom of the press does not mean the license to undermine the moral fiber of the youth of our land and to pander to their lowest instincts. To those of you who think that I exaggerate, I suggest

that you take a walk some day in your local community and surprise yourself with what you can purchase in stationery stores and corner newsstands in the way of vicious literature. Censorship is repugnant to our American way, but would you call it censorship to restrain a child from entering a burning building in which he could do nothing else but lose his life? It certainly seems to me that a democratic society interested in preserving the moral wholesomeness of its children and youth has some responsibility in this area.

The founders of our Nation built a democracy rooted in religion. They held to a natural moral law made by God and binding on all men. But they did not intend that our precious liberties should be abused to the moral detriment of the youth of the land. It is the responsibility of a democratic society to inculcate in its youth the natural moral law, and the eternal principles of religion—principles which are at once the way of life and the way to eternal life.

Ours, then, in the months to come, is the sacred trust to formulate standards and programs of child welfare in terms of all these basic considerations. God grant that in these eventful days, fraught as they are with the fate and the future of humanity, we may act wisely. In acting for the children and youth of today we safeguard the America of tomorrow.

May this conference help to confer upon the children and youth of America opportunities and guarantees for the preservation of human rights and dignity, and for the development of our fundamental democratic institutions—the home, the school, and the church—which today we love and which tomorrow, pray God, *they* will revere!

The CHAIRMAN. We are all very grateful to Father Keegan for putting into words what many of us have been thinking. I think it is a fine note to strike at the beginning of this Fourth Conference on Children, when we are beginning to be aware of the spiritual results and values which are back of our efforts to make the material world a better place in which people may live and develop.

Two or three people present today were responsible for organizing the first White House Conference, which convened in January 1909. The mere titles of the various conferences indicate to us something of the growth of thought, understanding, and responsibility which has gone on in the United States in all these years.

The first conference was called "The Conference on the Care of Dependent Children." There are, of course, many people who are not here today, and who have long since gone over into the other world, who had a part in the building up of that first conference, and we hold them in grateful memory as we think of the work that they did. We hold others, too, who are prevented by a great variety of reasons from being here today, in deep gratitude. I am sure that you will forgive me, all of you, if I speak to you of one who is a

friend to most of us and who lies now in the extremity of illness, Lillian Wald, and say to you that she has expressed over and over again in the past 6 months her interest in this project, and her hope that this conference will come to final fruition, and that it will be one of the great steps forward since the conference of 1909, in which she took so conspicuous a part.

It was the conference of 1909 which gave impetus to the movement for the general establishment of mothers' pensions and, therefore, the opportunity to keep together homes and to keep children living and growing up within home influences, the importance of which Monsignor Keegan has emphasized today. It was that conference also which gave impetus to the establishment of the Federal Children's Bureau, and I think most of you who are in this room today would agree that it has been one of the great instruments for civilization in this country.

Mr. Homer Folks served as vice chairman of that conference, and has always since then been the friend of the Children's Bureau. He was chairman of one of the important committees of the 1930 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Through a long career Mr. Folks has been one of our real statesmen in matters pertaining to public health and social welfare.

Today, in addition to his work as secretary of the New York State Charities Aid Association, he is chairman of the National Child Labor Committee, vice chairman of the Public Health Council of the State of New York, and carries heavy responsibilities in many other organizations.

Notwithstanding all this, he has consented to serve as chairman of the central committee of this conference, the Report Committee, which is charged with the responsibility of developing a comprehensive report on the major issues with which this conference will deal.

It is my privilege now to present to you Homer Folks, who will discuss the major objectives of this, the fourth White House Conference on children.

The Fourth White House Conference on Children

By Homer Folks, Secretary, State Charities Aid Association of New York

Thirty years and three months ago yesterday, the first session of the first White House Conference on Children met in this room. It was a streamlined conference. The committee on arrangements consisted of three persons—the late lamented and beloved Thomas M. Mulry, and two who are here today, Mr. James E. West and myself. It was Mr. West who conceived and promoted the idea of such a conference. He did it with a charming persistence which could be neither rebuked nor evaded. The conference had no money and no staff. Jimmy, he did all the work! The complete work of the conference was comprised within 2 days, January 25 and 26. Nevertheless, its conclusions and recommendations appear to have had great influence and remain potent. Apparently, they will be self-liquidating by general acceptance and full application.

Each of the previous three conferences was deeply influenced by the trend of major events and public opinion at the time. It is not only suitable, but also inevitable, that this conference should deal with children in a democracy. We would have been curiously unimaginative had we done otherwise.

It should be noted too that now, more than at any previous time, it is peculiarly appropriate that this conference should be held in the historic home of the leader of the American democracy. When have so many momentous laws for the welfare of children and their families been written upon the statute books, when so many far-reaching administrative agencies created and put into action, as during these past 6 years? We are not bringing child welfare to the White House; it is already an established resident therein.

In planning for this 1939 conference, we have been looking ahead, not to 1940, but to 1980 or thereabouts. Somewhere within these United States, within the past few years, was born a child who will be elected in 1980 to the most responsible office in the world, whose incumbent lives here. We cannot guess his name or whereabouts. He may come from any place and from any social or economic group. He may now be in the home of one of the soft-coal miners, or in the family of a sharecropper, or quite possibly in the home of one of the unemployed, or in a family migrating from the Dust Bowl, or in a college professor's family, or he may be surrounded with every facility,

convenience, and protection which money can buy. Very likely his home is on a farm. Even Dr. Gallup with his poll can give us no light on this problem.

If we could unroll the scroll of the future enough to read his name and whereabouts, how many things we would wish to have done for him, how carefully we would wish to guard his health, his surroundings, his education, his associates, his travels, his ambitions—and what a gorgeous mess we almost certainly would make of it. Could we be wise enough, by any chance, when we crossed the threshold of his home, to salute not the child but his parents and say, "This job is of immeasurable importance, but it is yours—none of us can take your place, but let us help you in every way in which you need help. We will provide for you the needful things which are beyond your reach."

Since we cannot know his name or address, we have only one opportunity to see that the President of 1980 will be prepared for his job. We must decide what are the major needs of all children who are to become useful, competent, public-spirited citizens. We must, most seriously and without delay, see that all the needful steps are taken to make these minimum provisions available for all the children of the United States—for every last one.

That will be no waste of effort. If reasonable and practicable measures for the protection, education, and civic development of all children are taken, we will have included several other Presidents to be elected shortly before or after 1980, several hundred governors of our 48 States, several thousand mayors of our 3,000 cities, and tens of thousands of legislators of cities, States, and Nation; as well as scores of millions of citizens who will select and elect the men and women who are to fill these thousands of responsible posts. They will set the tone of American public life, will determine how well democratic government in America can and will serve the needs of its citizens.

I speak at the moment mainly of public services, because we think first of political democracy. I do not lose sight of the fact that the training and spirit of these millions of citizens which will give us political democracy at its best will also produce responsible leadership for, and will permeate with democratic ideals, those great areas of life which remain, and must remain, to nongovernmental forces and agencies.

The world has been told lately that this democratic society, in which the children of the United States have been reared up to now, is a failure; that if it ever had any value, it is now obsolete. We have been told this, not by a few writers, speakers, or professors

(we might ignore them!), but by men who now speak for several of the most powerful nations in the world.

We can react in different ways to this bad news as to the health of our democracy. We can deny it as preposterous, and let it go at that; or, admitting no slightest shadow of doubt as to the virtues and the future of democracy, we can make this an occasion to take a fresh look at its actual practical operations affecting the welfare of children on the various levels of governmental action, in the different geographical areas, and in the various social and economic groups. Should we find, as we surely will, that in numerous respects, in providing for children those services and protections which are essential, we have fallen far short of achieving our established purposes, of carrying into effect our chosen public policies, we can then quietly make the necessary readjustments, correct the errors, speed up the rate of progress, and prove that democracy is a developing process, capable of adjustment to varying social needs, and of providing suitably and effectively for such needs at all times and in every part of every one of the 48 States.

This then, I think, is the special task of the White House Conference of 1939: (1) To determine and define the minimum needs for the suitable rearing of children to be adequate citizens of the American democracy; (2) to measure the extent to which these services are now being actually rendered and where they fall short in volume, quality, or distribution; (3) to find out the causes for such shortcomings as may be found; and (4) to ascertain and recommend how such causes can be removed, and how suitable provision for child health, training, and development may be adapted to every type of condition and circumstance, and be effective for every child in these United States.

It is not difficult to state some of the subjects into which we will need to inquire as deeply as we can. For all children provision must be made for health, for education, and for what we now call welfare. Interpreted broadly, these include most aspects of child life. We know that every child should be well born; that every prospective mother needs information, observation, and care; that all children should be protected from disease and health hazards; that every child should have enough suitable food, and we begin to know what "enough" is, and what "suitable" is; that the housing of his family should be compatible with health and vigor; that as he grows older every child and youth should have that degree of optimistic confidence and agreeable expectation of participation in the affairs of life and of the community which seem to spring naturally from physical well-being.

The educators can tell us much about what the child needs in school year by year, and how he can be provided with that atmosphere, those opportunities, which will lead him step by step to that poise, openness of mind, objectiveness of thought, and social attitudes which constitute good citizenship. All this we can find set forth admirably in recent studies and reports.

The economic well-being of the child's family, the assurance of an income sufficient to provide at least a reasonable standard of living as to essentials, is not so much a third factor to be added to health and education, as an indispensable condition for their realization.

When we ask how far these well-thought-out plans for health, education, and welfare are now actually carried into effect, we shall find many highly creditable achievements. We shall find truly notable progress in large geographical areas, and in particular phases of health, education, and welfare. Yet those who know most about these subjects, who have gone deeply into our present activities in health and in education, are candid critics. They do not fail to point out to us surprising shortcomings, as in, for instance, the recent studies of the Nation's health. Also, the most searching study ever made of the great educational system in the State of New York has recently been embodied in a report which enumerates an alarmingly lengthy list of things needing to be done, in some cases urgently and quickly. In particular, there seems to be unanimity of opinion that the schools have done least well that task which is the most vitally important—preparation for citizenship.

When we come to ask what has held us back from a more complete service in health, education, and welfare, the going is not quite so easy. We have diligent inquiry and hard thinking to do. Some of our difficulties are reasonably clear. We started as a group of isolated communities, largely self-sufficient. We have grown into great cities and small cities and villages, bound together by an ease of transportation, an immediacy of communication, and a community of interest which are nothing less than revolutionary. But we have not had the vision and the courage to scrap the governmental machinery set up for smaller and more isolated communities. We cling to township units for health and to one-room schools for education, under conditions having no likeness to those in which they were established. We just cannot bring ourselves to give up local agencies and local jobs.

Again, we are still possessed by the idea, which was relatively sound in the early and simple days, that any good man can do almost any job; that in any case the home-town job should always go to the home-town boy. We learn many things in laboratories about the control of disease and the protection of health, but do

not, in many areas, provide ourselves with health officers qualified to make this needed protection a reality. The idea is still widespread that a public job exists principally to provide a salary for some local citizen, rather than to secure the benefits for *all* local citizens of the competent performance of some essential public service. Many of us seem to have no twinges of conscience in using public office for reward for partisan services, past and future, instead of for carrying into effect a vital public service. If it is not vital, it should be dropped.

Finally, when we come to ask ourselves how these failures to carry through can be corrected, how these obstacles which have held us back can be removed, we come into close quarters with our real opportunity. How are we to win freedom in readjusting areas of government—local, State, and Federal—to new conditions; how are we to convince communities and States that technical jobs can be performed only by qualified people?

Perhaps the answer—or at least one answer—is to make the fact clear that these shortcomings are not merely failures to do certain useful things; they are also real dangers to our entire democratic structure and system. If we can make it clear to all that democracy in these practical administrative respects is on trial, that democracy must succeed, but that it can succeed administratively only by being more flexible, more sensitive to failures in efficiency and results, we may stir into action large numbers of people who otherwise might not be vitally interested. In this line of argument, in identifying patriotism with performance rather than with fireworks, we shall be on solid ground.

It is a sacred duty of every one of our citizens in his own field to help to demonstrate democracy to the judgment of civilized man as the best way to manage our communal life. From this viewpoint we must think of the improvement of public administration, from the top to the most humble position, as being not merely a desirable thing because of the immediate results involved, but as being an imperative thing because in fact democracy is on trial, and its future—our future—is at stake.

While I have spoken primarily of democracy as government, and have emphasized those services which are provided by government directly, I fully recognize that the spirit of democracy must also permeate all the other areas of life. Serious thought must be given also to the family and other nongovernmental factors which deeply influence the lives of children. The success of democracy in the government area seems to me the first and an essential strategic step in the accomplishment of these other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Folks, we are, as I am sure you have realized by the spontaneous applause, deeply grateful to you for your insistence on the things that are fundamental in our thinking about our civilization, and about our children. I think we were all very well aware, though we were too polite to applaud, of the graceful technique with which you introduce that always difficult subject—political patronage. Whereas, of course, technical services are not to be performed by the home-town boy, merely because he is a home-town boy, and has some political favor in that community, we must not forget that in the development of our great democracy there is much to be said for having the government of the intricate things that affect the lives of the people very intimately carried on by people who are close enough to them to gain and continue to hold their confidence.

I remember that we thought it a great day when we found that we had in the State of New York a Governor who cared about the social implications of life in his State, and when we had in New York City a mayor who was concerned about what became of dependent children, poor women, poor families, and prisoners taken up for drunkenness and petty crime. We thought that it was a great gain when those elected to office cared about those things. Hasn't that been the political influence of this group here and of thousands—hundreds of thousands—behind you everywhere who have said it would be desirable if all officers of government, including Presidents of the United States, always knew something about the needs of the people, and the ways by which those needs could be met, and care as deeply as we did? That, I think, is the direction in which we are turning in our political life, and we must not lose sight of the advantage of the politician in social work. We must not be selfish and think that the social worker, if he went off into politics, would immediately change and redeem politics, because he does not, as some of us can tell you.

There is great need for blending these two fields, both of which have been magnificently useful in the development of life in a democracy, of keeping the democratic form close to the people, and still increasingly intelligent and serviceable on the technical side.

I want to tell you one interesting little episode of the planning of this conference. While most of the planning was easy, the selection of the date for the first meeting was difficult. After the President had accepted the invitation to be the Honorary Chairman of the conference, when the committee went over to ask him what would be convenient dates for him for the holding of the first meeting, dates when he could certainly be here and address the conference as he has this morning, he went over his calendar and picked one or two possible dates in the months of March and April. Then as he checked those dates off on his calendar, he said to us, "Before you settle on a date, I hope you will be sure to pick a date when my wife is in town, and can be here." He said it just as simply as that, and then he added, "You know, I think my wife will be very much interested in this conference." Then he added, just as simply and modestly as any other husband speaking of a gifted wife, "And she might be useful." I do not believe he realized quite how useful she could be to us and

to all who are trying to promote a method of doing the right thing by our fellowmen on this earth.

I have not told this story on Mrs. Roosevelt yet, though it occurred last October. The Chief Justice of Australia was giving some lectures at Harvard this year and was in this country for about 6 months. Just before he went away he came to see me. He said, "I want to talk about a lot of things." He had been everywhere in the country and talked to everyone that he met—all sorts of people—and he felt that he knew America very well indeed. He said to me, "You are very lucky in this country, you know; you will never have either fascism or communism so long as Mrs. Roosevelt goes around the country giving the people confidence in the integrity of the human relationship, of the relationship of men to their government." And that, I thought, was something that I would write down and have illuminated and put on a scroll, and give it to her sometime, but I am giving it to her now, as an introduction to what she is going to say to us in this Conference on Children in a Democracy.

Children and the Future

By Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt

That is a very nice story, but I don't know that there is really much hope to be derived from it, because I don't think it is what I give other people that matters, as I go around the country. The really important thing is what you learn as you go around the country. You know a great deal more about the subject of this conference, from many points of view, than I can possibly tell you, but I have learned a few things in going around the country during the past few years, and that is what I want to talk to you about today.

It seems to me most important in caring for children—in doing an intelligent job from the physical standpoint of prenatal care, or from the point of view of providing for children a suitable environment and the possibility of growing up into strong young people—to look at the country on a very much wider front than we have been able to in the past. It seems as though we ought to be able to get a much better picture across to our general constituency now than we ever have before, and that, I think, is a vital thing to do. We really must have a general picture, whether in connection with the physical care of children, their education, their surroundings, their recreation, or their community life. We are growing so much closer together that it matters greatly to everybody what happens to children anywhere in the United States.

I have had people say to me, "Oh, those conditions exist in that place, but they won't affect us here. They are away off." I used to hear people say that such and such things existed in the slums of New York City, but it certainly was not going to matter to anyone on Park Avenue.

We are beginning to realize that it is the whole community that counts. I do not think that we in New York or New England can afford to be indifferent to the way children are growing up in certain States where it is hard to get medical care, where perhaps the schooling is not so good, where perhaps there is less interest in recreation. We have to take a national interest; we have to know our Nation.

I say this in connection with every kind of governmental or charitable activity, but I think it is more important where children are concerned than anywhere else, because they are the future. They are going to make the Nation. If we do not know what goes on all

over the country, we cannot possibly tell what is going to happen in our own communities a few years from now. We may be coping with conditions in our own communities that are the result of trouble originating hundreds of miles away.

Not so long ago, I went through part of a city in a State very far away from here. I could not help thinking all the time: What of the children who are living under these conditions? They may be in New York City or some other place 10 years from now, and what are they going to bring to those cities?

The person who took me around in this particular place—the one person who seems to be really interested in changing the conditions—is a Catholic priest. The houses face each other across a narrow, muddy street. They are mostly two-room houses. They often house as many as 10 persons each. And in the middle of the street, serving the entire street, are usually two or three rather tumble-down privies. Next to them, coming right up beside them, are pipes with faucets on them. And from these pipes is taken the water supply for that street.

As I went through those streets I could not help thinking, "I wonder how many criminals are hidden in this part of the city and I wonder how much the children know about it. And I wonder what kind of training they are getting in any decent kind of living." When my very gentle but energetic guide said, "This is the place where all the criminals in the town hide," I was not very much surprised.

That is just one place. There are plenty like that. We had some alley slums in Washington. We have a few less now, but we know what they are like, and every city knows. And we have plenty of rural slums in which children are having a hard time to grow up. I really think the thing which is menacing the future is that we do not know our country as a whole. We need to get across to the people of every part of the country that this Nation is no longer sectional. What happens anywhere is important to every part of the country.

You may think that it does not matter what happens to the migratory laborers in the Southwest and on the West Coast, but it does. It matters a great deal. Those children who cannot get schooling, who grow up in unhealthy conditions—they are going to be citizens some day, and how do you suppose they are going to become intelligent citizens of a democracy?

We have reached the point where we have to ask our young people to think about what democracy means to them, whether they really care about preserving democracy. I was interested in having one person write me the other day that a youngster had gone to a

meeting where they were discussing housing in migratory camps and in road camps on the West Coast. As this youngster came out of the meeting, he said, "Well, if they can't afford to have better houses, what difference does it make to us?"

That remark showed that, young as he was, something was wrong with his education because all of us, young and old, ought to know what difference such things make to us. We ought to learn—especially in our schools—that it makes a difference to us under what conditions children grow up and under what influences they are living.

Yesterday I went to the meeting of the rural-youth group that has been in session here for 2 or 3 days. They are the representatives, I should say the cream, of rural young people in this country. They came from 27 States, and they were picked by the heads of farm organizations to come to Washington to talk about rural-youth problems. I was very much impressed with them; they were a fine group of young people. But they are in danger of becoming very narrow because they are conscious only of the good things that their own organizations do. They have only just begun to be conscious of the fact that their organizations touch only about 10 percent of the young people in most of their communities. That came out yesterday.

In all the work that we are planning, in all our conceptions of work that needs to be done over a long period of years, I think we should stress that we are trying to bring the whole Nation up to better standards, that we are trying to produce for the future a healthier group of children, a group of children who, because they are physically healthy, because they know what it is to live under decent conditions, can profit by a better type of education—become more useful in their communities and the bulwark of democracy.

I told these youngsters yesterday that I doubted if many of them had given much thought to what their real responsibility is to government when they live in a democracy. It was quite evident as they talked that they never had. They had no idea of the fact that they are really a part of their government, and that it does not matter that each of them is just one individual, that it is the aggregate of what they all do that makes a difference in their communities.

I wondered very much if any one of these youngsters, of whom many are of voting age, had ever taken the trouble to know the people who are doing the job of government in their local communities or in their States. I very much fear that they had not because they were taking their whole government—their whole form of government—for granted.

Yes, they believed in a democracy, they thought it was a perfectly good form of government. We have had it a long while and they did not wish to change it. But they did not think about it as a government to which they had to give something as individuals. If you are going to give something to the community, you have to know more about it and about your own Nation. You have to know what you are up against in the Nation as a whole.

And so as I look into the future I hope that one of the things a group of this kind is going to do is to paint that picture before the country on as big a canvas as possible so that the whole country will become conscious of the needs of children everywhere in the United States.

Do not let us be placid because in our own communities things are all right for the moment. Let us realize that our future lies in the hands of the children throughout the United States, and let us be just as interested in things that are happening to children anywhere in the Nation as in what is happening to our children at home.

That is, I think, the one way we can be sure of giving the children of today a more vital part in our democracy and a really vital part in shaping and enjoying the Government of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. We are all sincerely grateful to you, Mrs. Roosevelt, for what you have said to us this morning. More than that, we are sincerely grateful for what you have done in the past 6 years in making the people of the United States realize and make personal for themselves the objectives to which this group and those it represents have long been devoted. You have made a much larger group recognize their responsibility as Americans, for putting their house in order, and going forward together as brothers and sisters to make this a good country for children to grow up in.

Section Meetings

Section 1: Objectives of a Democratic Society in Relation to Children

Chairman: James S. Plant, M. D., Director, Essex County Juvenile Clinic, Newark, N. J.

EXCERPTS FROM DISCUSSION

The CHAIRMAN. We want to get from you a picture of the sort of thing you think the Report Committee should be considering during the coming year. We are not here today to solve any problems. We want, in the coming year, to construct a report. We have thought that in view of what was said this morning, and in view of the work you have been doing yourselves in your particular fields, it would be of enormous help if we could have from you ideas and suggestions concerning the work of the conference.

It seems to me that we might properly work within some such frame of reference as this: We might consider that child welfare does not at any time represent a fixed goal but requires a constant restatement of problems in view of changing conditions. I should like, among other considerations, to know if you have some feeling that our problem is much more that of a careful restatement, from year to year, of the problems of child welfare than it is that of thinking in terms of solving problems of child welfare. If this be the case, then we have the question of whether there are any core problems, to be restated always in terms of new inventions and developments but thought of as core problems. If there are such core problems, how may they be described? For instance, is it correct to say that children need to have a sense of emerging justice, to feel that things are on the move, developing?

Who wants to make the first suggestion as to what the Report Committee should be thinking about?

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM. I should like to suggest that democracy is an achievement. It is not something which arises spontaneously in human society. If you observe child society, and the spontaneous play group that arises naturally, you will notice that it is a fascist group and not a democratic group, and that it has two essential characteristics of a fascist group.

First, it follows the leader principle. It does not have an equalitarian way of finding out who the leader should be, but someone automatically comes forward as the leader, and the others follow. They do not have a chance to take into consideration their own personalities but they are followers, merely accepting the ideals that are set before them.

The other characteristic of the fascist group is that it must have an enemy. It may be that someone in the group is looked down on and is always persecuted, by either an inside or an outside group, but somebody has to be the goat in a fascist society.

It has taken years and centuries and ages of human development to develop democracy. It seems to me to be of primary importance to indoctrinate children with a democratic way of life. If that be coercion, let us make the most of it. The way to do that is to show children in the schools the democratic ways of life by actual practice, in such things as teaching them respect for individuals in the classroom, teaching them that every other child is to be respected. No matter whether he belongs to another race or nationality or whether he is a queer person, nevertheless there is something good in him and he must be respected.

The CHAIRMAN. If I see the full measure of this, we on the Report Committee are faced with the problem of whether you are interested in our discussing the indoctrination of some sort of idea, or the alternative of so much letting-alone of the child that he will develop for himself what he feels to be his best way of living. Do you feel that we ought to go into that question? First of all, does that seem to be an issue to the rest of you?

EDWARD L. ISRAEL. I am delighted that the first speaker brought up this subject, because I was somewhat afraid it was going to be overlooked. Many of us have been fearful that the conference might be dominated by social workers, and that it would resolve itself into a highly specialized discussion of some of the things which have been the concern of other conferences, and which I realize have been invaluable.

The leadership technique of totalitarian groups has civilization fearful of it, particularly the intellectuals, because of the manner in which it has been manipulated by the 150 percent patriots. We have adopted an antagonistic attitude toward indoctrination within the confines of a democratic education. Yet I think we must come to the realization that one of the real things that should issue out of this conference is the means by which a democratic indoctrination can be achieved.

We all know we are living in an age where, more than ever before, childhood is underprivileged. We know that even if we, of our generation, have had to go through a certain amount of crisis, we may have nevertheless a psychological attitude of sympathy toward our civilization because at one time or another it gave us what we sought, and may at some time give us a renewal of that. The child approaching that society has no such background if his life has been frustrated from the start, if from his earliest childhood he has been the object of social-welfare work. If he has to roam the streets for a job, or has to do "made work," he has no sympathy toward the society in which he lives. He cannot see why some of us become sentimental about democracy; he cannot see the value of it. We cannot misjudge him if he adopts the attitude that the whole thing is a mistake; that if a leader principle is going to give him an opportunity for life, that is the thing he ought to follow.

We have to realize that there is another aspect to the democratic technique, and that is that it requires time. We have no blueprint that says: "This is the panacea for our ills." We are an experimental group. We know no cut-and-dried plan that is sound and scientific. But in carrying on social reform according to the democratic plan, we must realize that there is a certain morale that has to be developed,

particularly within our children and youth, so that our children may grow up with an understanding of the slowness of the democratic method, and of the necessity of the adoption of a certain attitude of sympathy, even though there may be involved in that attitude a great deal of—I hate to say it because I do look rather smug and comfortable—suffering. I think that is fundamental in any democratic process, and unless we can get that across to our children, through the churches, through the schools, through the homes, and through our social agencies, I am very much afraid our whole venture is doomed to failure. I do not think there is anyone who views, critically and understandingly, this whole process through which we are living who does not have that fear in the back of his own mind.

And so when you raise this matter of indoctrination, the question of the psychological attitude is really germane to the subject, and I want to record my conviction that, while it is not the whole answer to the problem, it is fundamental.

LELAND FOSTER WOOD. It seems to me we have two interesting foci here. One has to do with democracy and the other has to do with children. I am quite in sympathy with what has been said by the two preceding speakers, which bears upon the interpretation of the word "democracy." We have met to consider how to safeguard the interests of democracy and to advance them, but I should like to suggest that we also focus our attention upon the child, because after all if there is a differentiation between the two, we are here more to advance the interests of the child than to advance democracy. That is a false antithesis, but if we were to choose we would choose the child rather than a theory of government. So I suggest that we focus a good deal of attention on the child in the family, the child in the home, and, as Professor Folsom has suggested, the further democratization of the child in the school. I suggest that we promote the idea of the democratization of our American homes. At all times in the background, of course, and occasionally in the foreground, will be the problem of the environment and the basis of support on which a family can live normally and democratically.

We call our form of government democratic, but we could hardly call our form of American culture democratic. Certainly it is not democratic so far as its provision for the welfare of the family is concerned—at least, not thoroughly democratic. I think you might describe the family as a very necessary and vital, a little old-fashioned, long-continuing—or one might say ever-continuing—institution which, in the course of events, has been caught in the midst of giant forces which have arisen in modern life. I suggest the focusing of our democratic interest in life, to a certain degree at least, upon the question of how far our type of culture and mode of life are favorable to the family, so that the children may live properly and wholesomely.

Therefore, I think we must consider many questions which I am not going to relate, but I will suggest one or two. First, what can we do to promote the forming of families? I do not think that is too remote. The child coming into the world must find around him a family life that is well set up and has the possibilities of integration and security. Can we do something for our young people who are going to form the families of tomorrow, to aid them to set up a family that will have

better prospects of integration, of emotional unity? That involves all the problems being considered by the various groups.

The children of tomorrow: we want them to be well born, of course; that is basic. But I think we also want every child to come into a domestic atmosphere which, so far as possible, will be a favorable psychological climate in which to develop. What about forms of service that will aid husbands and wives who are either parents or going to be parents to compose those minor difficulties which, often through lack of care and guidance, may develop into major difficulties and disruption of the family? As we look about our American scene today, we see scarcely any provision for assistance to ailing families. I think it is fair to make a comparison between individual health and family health. We do everything possible for personal health, but very little to aid the health of families. We can do a great deal to safeguard the health of the family, which is the normal environment of the child. I will close by saying: Let us, therefore, with all the other important considerations that are bound to come up, give a great deal of attention to the felicitation of family life around the child.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we all recognize the cultural drift you have mentioned as one of the things that has made the problem of bringing up the child in a democratic way much more difficult than in the past. I do not see how we can escape facing the drifts that have occurred in American family life. I will be quite frank to say that the committee so far had not primarily thought of the child in the American family. Unquestionably, the stresses upon family life furnish an extremely important factor.

FREDERICK MAY ELIOT. It seems to me that the child must be considered first of all in connection with the family, and I would say that we must go even deeper into the problem than was suggested by the previous speaker, and raise the question of whether or not a child should come into a family; whether a given family is a proper family for the child to come into. No matter what the democracy may be like, if the child comes into a family where, by reason of the economic or the physical or the mental set-up, there is not a good chance for a normal life to develop, it seems to me that presents a fundamental problem for democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the group agreed that the question is not the family, but the family in a democracy? Is that a fair way to say it?

Dr. Wood. I took that for granted, myself. I think both foci are interesting. I don't want the child overlooked.

SAMUEL W. HARTWELL. I think we will be of greatest help to the Chairman if we canvass the people we work with and think about questions that arise as we work at our particular job in trying to help children to a better adjustment in life, and then say to the committee: This is the thing we want discussed.

It seems to me that the committee should concern itself with education. What is education, in the broadest sense, doing to our children? Looking at it from my standpoint, one of the difficulties seems to be that we have very rapidly brought into operation universal education of a rather specialized and advanced type, before we had a social system that was ready to take care of the people that were educated. We have promised the people who were educated that education would

bring social security, that education would bring happiness, that education would bring culture. We did that before we were ready to carry out our promise.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about what we would call formal education?

Dr. HARTWELL. Yes. I am thinking especially of the increase in Pennsylvania of the age of compulsory education to 18 years, thereby extending by 1 year the failure and confusion of many of our young people by forcing them to go on to school when they have reached the limit of their education.

Is everything being done to inform and train professional people in the field of child welfare? I am laboring with a lot of teachers now, and I think it is helpful, but what is the matter with training our professional people—lawyers, physicians, clergymen—in terms of child welfare? What can they do about it, and what do they know about it? If all the physicians in the United States concerned themselves with these individual families, if they had some scientific knowledge, what could they do?

Another thing: I would like to know whether any university in the United States is, or is thinking of, formulating a training course for parent education. Doctors think they know something about the health of children; ministers think they know something about the need for religious life; and psychiatrists think they know something about the thinking processes. I believe we are pretty well agreed that if we experts know anything about child welfare we have to teach it. How much is being done to train people and to create community feeling about the things we do know? There are many people in this world doing other jobs who are highly fitted for the particular task of being community educators.

One more point: We, as a democracy, have established many institutions for children all over the country. I would like to see some research on what we are doing with the children that we have in our public and private institutions, especially the public institutions. What are we doing to help make them better adjusted in a democracy? If we cannot accomplish something with these children, over whom we have control, what right have we to theorize about children in general? I would like to see emphasis given to efforts made by institutions in the field of child welfare.

GRACE L. COYLE. I should like to go back to the question of the preparation of children for life in a democracy. There are two things that concern me very much about the subject. You may remember that the first speaker said that children are naturally fascist in their own relationships among themselves. I think that is true, especially in early adolescence; but I would like to say that children are not so naturally fascists as fascists are naturally children. Fascism is a sign of immaturity, and we need to provide a community in which mature people can develop. If we do that democracy is the natural fruit of mature people. It seems to me that democracy is in the large, as a system of government, a relationship which, in the small, we see in the family, and that is why the family can be preparation for it. It involves mutual respect. When we talk about indoctrination, it seems like something we have to bring in from the outside. I think it is a thing that will develop of itself if the setting is right so that people can mature.

There are two things I think of which prevent that from happening, and which therefore may lead us into fascism, because they lead us into immature personalities. One is the lack of opportunity for jobs ahead of the school experience. The fact that we work is of great importance: (1) It enables us to assume our place in the world, and (2) it leads to the possibility of courtship and marriage. We have before our children today the expectation that when they get out of school they will be unemployed, perhaps for years. They know that. They have older brothers and sisters out of high school who are unemployed. Those who have that experience of hanging around with nothing to do are prevented from maturing into citizens capable of democracy.

Some of the foreign sociologists tell us that the great source of fascism is the unemployed intellectual young person. Young people stay in high schools longer now because of lack of opportunity. We keep them from growing up. We offer them no chance for jobs, and no chance for marriage. The two ways through which they might become capable of democracy are denied them. The best propaganda for democracy is an environment out of which it can grow.

The fascist States have one thing, and that is their social motivation. The American dream which has governed our past, the idea of developing individuality, leads to neurosis for the large number of people who cannot become bank presidents. It seems to me that sound society must provide some reasonable hope to which young people can devote themselves. The dictatorships have taken a collective hope—not an individual hope—and made it something that motivates young people. We do it in time of war, but we do not seem to be able to do it in time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. If it cannot be done, isn't that a worth-while thing for us to bring out? Shouldn't we face the situation?

Dr. COYLE. I wish this conference could deal with the methods by which children can develop into citizens of a democratic society. I believe that the myth, the thing ahead of us, must be present in every society. The individualistic myth is gone. Can we have a collective one which can be made as vivid to young people in our society as the dictators are making it for theirs? That seems to be the basic thing.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask one question: Are you people willing that the Report Committee face the negative things, the things we cannot do, just as frankly as the positive things? Or do you feel that we must come a year from now with a program, and that it must be something that simply has to work? I think there are two different types of reports that can be turned out, one that faces the real difficulties involved, as opposed to something else that would gloss over those things, or go around them, to present a positive program.

BENJAMIN E. MAYS. It seems to me we cannot escape pointing out some of the difficult things. I think we should not go too far in emphasizing these things and saying they cannot be done. It would raise difficulties. We are not so sure we cannot do certain things.

F. ERNEST JOHNSON. You ask, should the Report Committee face the negative aspects, things that cannot be done? Do you mean things that cannot be done unless something else is done? The report will not be illuminating unless all the negative aspects are faced. It will be a Pollyanna report. We have to inquire what we want to

achieve, and what is standing in the way. If the obstacles in the way are obstacles that have very extensive sanctions in our society, we should say so.

The CHAIRMAN. Secretary Perkins spoke this morning of starting out with democracy; but certain drifts have been pointed out that indicate we cannot take democracy for granted.

Dr. HARTWELL. It would be a good thing for instance for a child not to have feeble-minded parents. We could arrange that in a totalitarian state, but in a democracy we can't. We have to pay for democracy by inability to do certain things in child welfare.

Dr. MAYS. Does this not bring us face to face with the problem that somewhere we have to decide what kind of child we want to produce? It is all right to talk about the child in a democracy, but it seems to me this report should bring out the fact that there is a certain type of individual we are trying to produce. What kind of child, really, are we trying to produce?

The CHAIRMAN. I can add to your confusion by saying that I think that equally seriously involved here is the question of what we mean by democracy. I was hoping I would catch from you what you feel about the necessity of these fundamental definitions. I think your question is a very real one, but there is also the question of what we mean by democracy, and what we are working for.

JOSEPH P. LASH. I think one of the problems we face among young people is the frame of mind of a young person in a society in which there is relatively little chance of employment, a considerable possibility of war, and so forth. He or she can have one of two attitudes, either that this society is a heart-breaking one, or that we are living in a very adventurous period in which we can contribute to world history. The question I wish to propound is this: Dare we, the social workers of America—I graduated in social work—and others working with youth, try to invoke the participation of the young people in the solving of the problems?

The President of the United States, in speaking to the Young Democratic Clubs in 1936, said the age of geographical pioneering is finished, but the age of adventuresome pioneering is just begun. In our educational system, for example, how many high-school civics courses talk about the Wagner Labor Act? I think there is a basic question of how frankly these problems are faced in the schools. There is what might be called the practice of democracy within the school, student government, but what they mean by that is that a group of young people meet, they have a question before them, the principal sits there, and they turn to him and he tells them what his views are, and they agree with him. That I think is the opposite of what it should be. We should be able to make young people feel that democracy faces problems, and that they can help in the solution. But it is a very difficult thing in the home, in the school, and in the church actually to incorporate democracy in our proceedings rather than tell young people what to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I have been interested in the difference between giving an idea of adventure as something talked to the youngsters, or giving an idea of adventure out of actual example to the child. The picture of democracy as an adventure was just given as something

to fight for, something worth while. Already this afternoon we have had that same picture brought out in two ways, one that can be told to youngsters in formal education, and so forth, and then the other picture of its not being an indoctrinated thing so much as something we as adults live, making a world in which people can grow up, can mature.

ALICE SOWERS. It seems to me, in the first place, that we have accepted democracy for years, just as we accept free air, and we don't think anything about it until something comes along that appears to threaten to take it away from us. We have had generations of young people standing up and pledging allegiance to the flag who do not know what it is all about. We have people talking about what a wonderful country this is when they haven't seen a great deal of the country. And when it comes to a show-down, they do not know a great deal about what democracy is.

I am not afraid of the word indoctrination. They say the word propaganda is bad, and the word indoctrination is bad. Teaching is indoctrination—consciously or unconsciously it is there. We are indoctrinating the young people with the teacher's knowledge—or perhaps sometimes the teacher's ignorance—a good deal of the time. It seems to me that part of it is done consciously, and the teachers themselves should know much more about how consciously to inject ideas of democracy. Participation in an open forum was mentioned; that is all right, but unless we label it as such they do not recognize it. My work takes me over the State, and I always have both young people and adults in my groups. Invariably it is the adult who says, "You can't have democracy in the home because you have to have authority," and it is the young people who say, "You do have authority in a democracy, the only difference being that you elect your officials in a democratic government, and you don't elect your father and mother." The young people have a better understanding than the adults of the meaning of the word "democracy." Therefore, we must have a parallel program of adult indoctrination.

A minister in the past week said that more and more he is being called in to counsel in matters affecting the home. Our lawyers and judges are also being called in. My great hope is that out of this conference, in some way, we will draw together all of those people.

It seems to me we should not limit our report to questions for which we have solutions. I am not so sure we can solve them all, but if we have only enough foresight to bring out things we should do, some other generation might be able to solve them.

THE CHAIRMAN. As to parent education, I think these things must be seen as a part of the central core of children living in our present cultural set-up.

LOWELL J. REED. It seems to me that in several of the talks we have been led closer and closer to the core you speak of. If we could center our thought around education of the child and finally lead to the mechanism by which we can get the child into society at the end of that process, we might be able to focus on that.

THE CHAIRMAN. Let me ask this: How much should we provide for these children? To what extent should the child have to make his way into the democracy? What is the need for struggle and sorrow? Is that unfair to ask?

Dr. REED. No. I am glad to face it. I believe, just as Rabbi Israel said, that if children are not made to go through a certain amount of struggle, they will not be worth much. But we see a number of our children in a hopeless struggle, and whatever we can do to smooth the path will still leave enough struggle, in my estimation. We have had work in our high schools and in the CCC and other governmental agencies, trying to take out some of the struggle, but we have not had unified thought along the line of how children get into our democracy when they get through with their education.

Something has been said about what children we should encourage, and so forth. That is a vital question to us, and it is going to become more so. I have been a member of the Population Committee in this country, and have attended several international meetings on the subject. It is obvious at the present time that we are not producing enough children to keep the country going. When that fact becomes evident, sections of our population are going to pay attention to that matter and we are going to have all kinds of legislation on the subject. It is not at all too remote for you to consider that problem. One concrete thing the committee might do is to review the thorough program laid down by one of the democratic countries in the world, which is probably the best—not in a totalitarian sense, but in the sense we would like to view it—that a democratic society can adopt.

I would like to go on record on one more thing: I think it was said that a democratic society cannot choose its children. I think we have to carry the load of feeble-minded as to number. Genetics teaches us that even if you could sterilize certain people you would not make a dent in the number of feeble-minded.

The CHAIRMAN. You would be willing, if the committee went into the problem of population trends, to say that it was within this central core?

Dr. REED. Yes.

FREDERICK DOUGLAS PATTERSON. I want to suggest that in formulating these objectives, however trite they might be, one possible approach would be to state what seem to us to be the minimum standards acceptable in a democracy for all of the Nation's children. Minimum standards of education; minimum standards of health; minimum standards of home; and spiritual standards, if you please. I say that because it seems to me that one thing is very clear and that is that there is an alarming disparity of opportunity between what constitutes education in New York State, for example, and what constitutes education in Alabama. If democracy is to work, and if we expect it to work by constantly bringing opportunity into different areas, then it seems to me that the establishment of this minimum would be one of the first steps; then the next step would be to find out to what extent that minimum exists. Then we will be moving in the direction of doing something about these disparities in a democracy. Conceivably, in the matter of education, that would concern the quality of education—to what extent is the quality of education meeting the problem of unemployment, and so forth. There is some evidence to show that, regardless of the fact that we have missed the point in certain programs of education, those who have any form of education are better off than those who have none.

I make that suggestion as a very simple approach, but one that is necessary if we are to think of the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. I am tremendously interested in what you say, and it has been a thing very valuable in the medical field for instance. But I would like, as a member of the committee, to turn back to you the job of making up a set of minima in the emotional and spiritual fields. It is quite easily done in the physical field and in the field of education, in a material sense, but beyond that it becomes difficult.

JAMES B. CAREY. I think it is very important that the young people understand that the evils in a democracy are mere accidents and are not essential to a democracy. The youth of the Nation should understand democracy and practice it, and should understand that democracy is not something blueprinted in 1776. It is not just a system of government, not just regulations, but the opportunity to get the objectives they desire. And those objectives are not that happiness should be found for them, but that they should have a full measure of life, liberty, and opportunity to pull their own weight in the world. We should give them the opportunity to reach that goal.

RUTH LARNED. One thing that is of much importance is cultural diffusion. There are in this country children of foreign-born parents, grandchildren of the foreign born, and even children of American-born parents who have gone back to the foreign country but who have returned here because they want to make this country their home, who are most unfortunate individuals because of ostracism or discrimination. Many of the parents are reverting to old loyalties because they have no opportunity for expression in the democratic life of the United States. They are often a group apart, ardently wishing for an opportunity to take a part in the democratic life. They believe in democracy so far as they understand it, but they do not have an opportunity to practice it. Of course the American democracy is a composite of cultures, but the recent settlers and their children are very much discriminated against and are not considered, from the point of view of education, in a constructive fashion, so that they are given an opportunity to express the cultural background from which they come.

Dr. JOHNSON. I think it would be of service if the Chairman would tell us more fully what is in his mind about that core of ideas or values. I think we might be able to iron out the problems.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like more discussion on what has seemed to me to be a division here between teaching democracy and showing people democracy, that is, giving them the opportunity to grow up and find it. I think there are two different points of view there. I do not want you to agree; I would like to have people talk on both sides. That would help us much more in our thinking.

Dr. JOHNSON. I think it is a pity to interpret this discussion as representing two views. I don't think that some of us really want to indoctrinate according to the usual sense of the term, but I think we are fairly well committed to the conclusion that we accept certain values that are understood by the term "democratic way of life." I should be sorry to have the discussion appear to be just for and against indoctrination, because I do not believe that is the way the group divides. I think there is a choice, as Rabbi Israel said; but

that is another situation. We have to be good educators and understand that children do not grow just by being told. I appreciate the distinction you make as to the minima. Nevertheless, in this core you do have spiritual value, and we ought to be able to talk about that.

Dr. FOLSOM. I agree with Mr. Johnson that there really is no conflict here. We are trying to bring these people to live in a democratic society. I think, as Miss Sowers pointed out, we must give them experience in a democratic way of living, and must talk about it in such a way that they will formulate ideals and values of democracy at the same time they are having actual experience with democracy. It seems to me these two things need to be tied together, and that there is no conflict between them. We don't want all words, and on the other hand we can give democratic experiences, but those experiences may not pass on to the next generation; they may be disregarded.

What do you mean by democracy? I would like to say, as Mr. Carey pointed out, that democracy is a way of life. I would like to say also that any form of government, or any form of procedure in the economic sphere, that brings about this way of life is the desirable thing. We may have to have some flexibility in our economic sphere, in our form of procedure. I don't think democracy means there shall be no authority and no coercion or fighting. Some people seem to think that if you fight, then you are no longer democratic; if you assert authority and force at certain points, then you are no longer democratic. It is almost as though a physician said: "I am here to prevent pain. Hence, I won't operate because to operate may be painful."

I think democracy is the way of life in the home and in everyday life. The essential of that life is the recognition of the personality of each individual as an end in itself. No individual should be merely a means to an end, but every individual, from the very youngest, should have certain ultimate values in his own personality and his own experiences which everybody else is bound to respect.

Dr. COYLE. As I see it, we have been discussing on several levels. One of the reasons we sometimes slide beside each other is that we are on different levels. In the first place, we have been trying to formulate our own ideal. That ideal includes physical minima, educational minima, and it involves spiritual minima, which are more difficult to formulate. We need first to formulate those values. Some of us have been talking about how we get from there to reality, to carrying them out. Some of us get immediately to ways and means, especially on this question of improving family life, and how to get better education. But some of us have been talking about a somewhat different thing: How to bring up youth so that it holds this same ideal, which involves both physical minima and spiritual minima. We get this whether we tell young people or provide a setting. If we see the education of young people as one of the means, the methods of educating people include both what can be done by talk and what—more, I think—can be done by experience, in their own groups, in the schools, and in the families.

CHARLES F. ERNST. I think we have been confusing objectives with methods. The objectives in a democracy today are the same as they ever were. They have not changed from the objectives of democracy as we started. I was much impressed this morning by the objectives

stated by the group that came in the Mayflower: "The privilege of worshipping God." How simple that is. I am wondering, really, if we are not willing to have you report for us that there is no change in the objectives of democracy. It may be that the methods to be employed in reaching those objectives have changed. I am inclined to interpret the fact that nobody has mentioned any change in objectives to mean that there have been no changes. The things we seem to be crossed up on are the various methods of reaching the objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. One factor is the tremendous increase in the complexities of life. I might ask if these things which were stated 150 or 300 years ago are possible objectives in a group of people who have become so highly specialized through organization, who cannot know each other, who cannot have a feeling of belonging in a community.

I am sure a number of people here would speak with fire in their eyes about the opportunity of the child to grow in a democracy, and would ask us whether we give the child that opportunity, whether we do more than tell him he has it and then close the door in his face. I am not so sure those early basic objectives are still possible objectives.

AGNES M. BOYNTON. I was interested in your statement that we can no longer know each other, or have a feeling of belonging in a community. Is there any reason why we cannot change that? Is there any reason to say we must continue to be isolated because we live in a city? I come from a rural area, and I think perhaps there is something in community life which can be entered into in city living. Is it necessary to say that people cannot have this? Have we tried to give it to them?

We speak of a child growing into democracy. I would prefer to say a child is in a democracy and must be made to feel and live it. I think we can help him to learn to appreciate democracy more than has been the case.

The CHAIRMAN. What was meant by saying a child must grow into a democracy is that the child is not naturally or biologically democratic. I think the statement was made that as we know the child in early life he is the other kind of beast, and we have to train him in that just as we have to train him in his physical habits. I think the committee would be very much interested in exploring that.

ARTHUR H. RUGGLES. We have talked about many aspects of these problems. I suppose you have enough problems to take back with you already. We seem to have centered more on the problem of education in a formal sense than education in the wider sense. Probably some of the educators couldn't say much, but being a doctor I can say that I think one of the greatest needs is the problem of adequate leadership in the democracy, and by that I mean leadership in the schools. And when I say that I am not underestimating the importance of the home or of the church. It happens that society as now organized catches all the people in the school system for a considerable period of time. Sometimes they miss the home and sometimes they miss the church, but with few exceptions they are in the schools for a considerable period of time.

We have talked of various approaches. All of us know the importance of example on children, and I would suggest to you the importance of the selection and the training of the teachers of America. We speak of minimum standards. We certainly need minimum standards there, and one would be the adequate training

of all teachers. That would include an understanding of the democratic society on the part of the teacher, and the ability to exemplify and uphold and lead in the democratic way of thinking, feeling, and acting; then we would have a tremendous impetus in natural educational training.

All of us know how eagerly young people respond to responsibility. They can learn to put on their rubbers and brush their teeth at the age of 3 if given a chance. I suggest we tell them early and often all we know of the ways of life. Knowing the way of life and not getting into it is a serious thing. Perhaps these people getting out of high schools and not getting jobs might help us solve that particular problem. It would be wonderful occupational therapy for them to think about it and try to help us. I would like to leave with you the thought of the importance of the selection, training, and dignifying—and I mean dignifying in many ways—of the teachers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with the last point you made, as to persons trained for something and then frustrated in actually getting it, it has been hinted that that frustration could be measured in terms of mental break-down. Do you suppose the psychiatric group here could make a formulation of how much of the staggering total of break-downs is due to the thing that is cropping up—that we are training people for something and then not giving it to them.

Dr. RUGGLES. I was thinking on the preventive side of it. Instead of saying "Education is the key to all this," start fairly early on the problems of jobs, and take young people in partnership on this. I would like to see a piece of research on why some individuals get into the democracy and why some can't, and why some become soap-box orators, and so forth.

HERMAN E. HENDRIX. I am interested in the whole question from a school teacher's standpoint. If you can't tell us "What is democracy," where are the children going to learn it? I am wondering whether as an outcome of this meeting and of the larger meeting that is to follow in the year to come, there should not be a report to the children away down in nursery school: "What is democracy?"; then in kindergarten, "What is democracy?"; then to the elementary grades, "What is democracy?"; and in the high school, "What is democracy?"; and to the college student, "What is democracy?"; then to each of those groups, how the child or youth is going to fit into that program of democracy that somebody has laid down. I would call that indoctrination, and if that is the purpose of the whole program, I cannot see what else we poor school teachers are going to do. We, as a group, will have to insist on more training on the part of the school teachers, not only on the secondary level, but on the college level, and particularly in the teacher-training institutions; give them some mental hygiene and psychiatry.

There is another thing we school teachers should know: How is the school teacher two steps ahead of his community going to live in that community, because the school teacher gets his bread and butter from staying in that community. That is far-fetched, but it is a very real situation with Miss Sowers and me. Democracy won't mean anything if we cannot do that.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the things that has disturbed me all afternoon is the importance that we are giving to machinery, to more knowledge, and more techniques. Since this matter of teachers has

come up, I would say the question is very much more the selection of teachers than the training of teachers. I have caught the feeling that you cannot indoctrinate through telling people; you have to indoctrinate them by the way you live. I am speaking now just as a psychiatrist. Through the way we live as teachers, as parents, as ministers, and as various other individuals—through the way we live ourselves we must invite growth. It is the experience, I am quite sure, of every person who deals with other people, that some of the finest family set-ups, and some of the finest challenges to children to grow, come from people who do not have very high I. Q.'s. I see many mothers in my own clinic—if I may be personal—who put me absolutely to shame. It is something I feel this whole group has missed this afternoon, something about the aspects of living and demanding adventures and growth in the child that has nothing to do with what we teach, but has to do with the way we live.

Dr. ELIOT. There is a word I have missed all afternoon. This morning we heard a good deal about religion. Quite a bit was said about religion, and I think properly so. We think you have the hub of the wheel, even if you don't think you have it. You may not have all the spokes, but you have the hub. I think religion might be the clue. Now, with respect to indoctrination. Dr. Jacks said he met the head of a school one day, and he asked him what he was doing at the school about religion. The head of the school said: "Oh, we don't do anything about it directly. Of course we teach accuracy and honesty through arithmetic; and we teach respect for the property of others through geography, and so forth; and then once in a while we get somebody to come in and put it in words. That means that what religion we have we grow ourselves." I think there is something in occasionally putting it in words. I think all education comes through experience, but occasionally I think it is important to put it in words, to label the thing people have been doing; then it becomes significant to them.

Dr. SOWERS. I think the best way to teach is by what we do and not what we tell people, but I am still stopped at that point. That is, you and I may be excellent people for some to learn from, but what about the 120 million people? If all adults had a fair understanding of democracy and we had all these experiences offered in the home, we would still need a little labeling. But we have many people who do not have the same concept, from whom the children are getting experiences in something besides the democratic way of living, and I do not see what we are going to do without using the institutions that are here, and the techniques that we have. It still goes back to a technique, except it goes back to the adults. That is why I said that we must have a parallel program of adult education. When we know that a child comes from a home that has this understanding—we all know of fine homes, one I know, for instance, whose income is only \$25 a month—we know the child from such a home will come out a fine American citizen. But some type of education must take place. I think it goes back to better teacher and parent education, so that we will know that the adults with whom the children come in contact will have these experiences. I am willing to use the word "indoctrination," but there is still the need to face this situation: Can we extend the thing we are doing to reach more adults?

Mrs. JENNIE B. MOTON. I have been trying to satisfy myself as to the question, What is a democracy? Representing a minority group, I think we naturally turn to those whom we represent. This lady here to my left spoke this afternoon of pledging allegiance to the flag. I taught in a training school for 6 years where every morning thousands of children pledged allegiance to the flag and repeated the words "liberty and justice for all." Then, in view of various discriminations that we face in a Christian democracy, the young people are constantly asking: "What is it all about? What does it amount to, anyway?"

The home, the school, and the church are the three agencies through which we get over to the youth and to the adult the objectives of a democratic society in relation to children. The home, the school, the church. We face, as you know, the problem of so many homes, poor homes, poor location, poor housing, inadequate space, and in the schools we face the problems of short terms and poorly trained teachers, all too often. In the church, in the past so many of our ministers have tried to make us believe that in the hereafter we are going to have such things, that I often say, "How are we going to appreciate all that luxury when we get to heaven?"

One of the wisest of men once said: "Youth is vanity." We have learned better now, because the children are insisting that we learn better. Then there was the era when we said children should be seen and not heard; but the young folks have broken through the traces and they insist that they will be seen and they will be heard. When we go to church we pray and sing, and then when they see that we make no attempt—or very little attempt—to help the other fellow, it is pretty hard to explain that and to handle the children in the democracy. We feel we have made a very definite contribution to this country, which we love, and we are always willing to do our share. We are asking for improved conditions, and we are glad to have representation as a minority group.

The CHAIRMAN. I have hoped very much that this conference would not be particularly a professional conference, with a lot of professional interests in it, and that out of it could come a few basic things that we could all stand for, one of which—and I am speaking very personally now—is the matter that what we put down as a goal is a goal for everyone. My own personal feeling is that we are working toward that in developing this kind of conference.

RUSSELL J. CLINCHY. I wonder if Miss Coyle has not said what is running in all our minds: That democracy is an attitude toward life rather than a system. We talk as though we had a definite system. Yet it is not a system, but something deeper and more profound; it is the willingness to grant to the individual the right to think, to raise a question; it is the dignity of human personality of all races and creeds; it is the willingness to believe that a baby in a sharecropper's family today may be the future President of the United States. Those things are attitudes. It seems to me that when we say democracy is something without indoctrination or authority, we are not thinking to the point, because democracy actually does have authority. If it did not have authority in it, 51 percent of the people could do what they wanted to do to the other 49 percent of the people; but democracy says 51 percent cannot, and even 99 percent cannot do it to a 1-percent minority.

Ninety-nine percent of the people cannot plot against a religious minority of 1 percent. After all, there must be authority in the family. There must be authority to make the children drink milk whether or not they want to do it. There must be authority to make them pay attention to all the rules of health. Besides that, it seems to me there is indoctrination. Whether we talk about it or not, there is not one of us who would say we do not want monogamy in the home; but you don't have to tell the child that the father and mother live in monogamy.

The thing I would like to have come out of this group is that it is not the technique and it is not the system, but it is the attitude of life which—well, which makes you rejoice when Marion Anderson sings on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, and which makes you say: "That is the thing we want." And to say: "I rejoice that people of all races and creeds are as valuable as I am, and have the same rights." And to rejoice when an individual comes out of the lowest into the highest.

FREDA KIRCHWEY. I feel that the need for recognition of spiritual democracy is the thing that actuates us all when we meet to discuss the relationship of children to a democracy, in relation to what is going on in the rest of the world. We do not want it blotted out by forces from the inside or from the outside. I miss the relations of a good many of the points raised to the basic undemocratic processes that underlie many of the things spoken of as impediments to democracy.

It came up first when Rabbi Israel spoke of the attitudes that came out of insecurity. It came out when Miss Coyle spoke of impediments to democracy due to immaturity. And it has come up in so many of the suggestions, including the suggestion of the need for doing away with racial and religious inequalities, that I feel as though all of us were talking on a level in which what we say is valid, but it must find roots down below.

I do not see how we can discuss the question of whether the child is to be indoctrinated with democracy if at the same time we are thinking of the conditions under which the child is living in a sharecropper's house, or in one of the migratory families in California about which Mrs. Roosevelt spoke this morning. I think we speak too glibly of the problem being one to be solved in the home, in the school, and in the church. The things we are discussing must be faced before this conference is ended.

THE CHAIRMAN. I am quite sure you understood that Miss Lenroot has more of a feeling of the wholeness of this thing. If we deal with only a part of the conference, it is just to keep this thing from running absolutely haywire. The Report Committee has been hoping that it can begin fairly soon now to come back to you people, not in this kind of meeting, but in groups of six or eight in special fields, and say to you, "We have learned such and such things, now what do you think of them?"

One thing that is very important from now on is to divide you up into groups that can give help and criticism to parts of the report, so that when we come to the end of the year there will be a fairly cohesive sort of report, every part of which will have been subject to the review and criticism of particular groups, and then brought back from them with the life and reality they can give to it.

Section 2: Economic Foundations of Family Life and Child Welfare

Chairman: William Hodson, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of New York

EXCERPTS FROM DISCUSSION

The CHAIRMAN. The subject of this meeting is the economic foundations of family life and child welfare. As I look over this group, while I recognize here and there a distinguished economist, I think that most of you are not economists in the technical sense of the word. If we all were economists, I am quite sure that we should have no agreement among us whatever. One of the great problems that a mere relief administrator has in trying to forecast the future is that he finds no two economists who agree with each other. They are somewhat like social workers in that respect.

If I were to try to state very briefly what I think the subject of this section of the conference is I would like to put it this way: In our present economy there are a lot of folks who are unable to work and are therefore without income; there are a lot of folks who are perfectly able to work but they cannot get jobs and so they are without income; then there are a lot of folks who are working but at such inadequate wages that they do not have sufficient incomes. Thus our problem becomes primarily one of providing, through the industrial processes under a democracy, income through jobs.

I venture to say that if all of our people were employed at decent jobs at decent wages, we shouldn't have at this time the emergency problems which confront us. Basically, if all our people who can work were employed, and if they had sufficient income, they would be able to buy good housing, they would be able to buy the food which would provide nourishment for the family, they would be able to buy hospital care and the care of a physician, public-health care of all kinds. Under those circumstances we should not have anything like the problems which confront us today. Unfortunately, that is not the situation. I do not understand that it is the business of this particular group to try to find the way out with respect to the problem of employment and the problem of stimulating business in industry, although we shall touch upon that, no doubt, and its many implications as we go along in our conference with respect to the subject which is assigned to us.

I think I ought to say that this meeting, like certain popular programs over the radio, is unprepared and unrehearsed, and my instructions were to evoke comment from you, so that I am going to stop in just a moment. There were two things in our discussion this morning about which I do want to say a word.

In the first place, I was glad to have the President remind us and remind the country that there is such a thing as local government in

the United States of America. Very properly in the past decade our eyes have been focused upon Washington and upon our State capitals. It has been a great thing to see the Federal Government assuming responsibilities which it should have assumed a long time ago and it is a great thing to have the Federal Government and the State governments in partnership with the local units to provide the necessary relief and social and health services. But I think we have somewhat lost sight of the fact that the place where people live and the place where the services are provided is in the cities and in the counties. The localities that actually must do the work of government must raise their standards of personnel, they must have more money, and the attention of the country must be focused upon that need for efficiency. I think we can still say that the greatest failures in our governmental system are not at the Federal level, they are not at the State level; the greatest failures are at the local level, at the level of administrative performance. I hope our discussions, insofar as they relate to problems of government, may carry us into a consideration of how to make local government as effective as possible.

The other thing that occurred to me, as I listened to our experts this morning, was that there are so many problems that need to be thought through in the fields of health, education, industry, and welfare, that the danger may very well be that we shall find so many things wrong and have so many suggestions and recommendations to make about those things that are wrong that we shall not be able to focus on things which we can actually realize in terms of action. I am hoping that when we get through with all our discussions here we will have a fairly long-range picture of what is wrong and what needs to be done about it and can then focus our attention upon the few things that can be done within the next 3, 4, or 5 years, so that we can all get together and say that if those few things are done, or if we can get real and substantial progress in those areas, we shall have accomplished something effective for the children of America.

One other suggestion: I understand that our conference today is not for the purpose of discussing the validity of things to be done, but rather our purpose is to discuss what should be included on the agenda for discussion by the White House Conference during the coming year. Will you, therefore, in offering your suggestions here, consider them in the light of material which you would like to see the planning and reporting committees consider and discuss, rather than argue the particular merits of the suggestions themselves.

Just before the meeting started I received word that we were fortunate in having in this group Dr. Falk, the Assistant Director of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board, who will start the discussion with respect to certain material which he has.

ISIDORE S. FALK.¹ I want to touch on the opportunity we have from a new series of studies to provide some basic information on the underlying evidence as to the economic plight of children in the United States, with particular reference to the position of children in the urban areas of the country. In a memorable speech which shocked

¹ The full text of Dr. Falk's talk may be obtained on request from the Social Security Board.

many complacent Americans, the President declared that one-third of the Nation is ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. This state of affairs, however disquieting for the present, becomes more ominous when we look to the future and to the outlook for continued national growth and development. Two-thirds of the children of this Nation—its future citizens—are growing up in the least fortunate third of our families.

The effects of poverty, especially in childhood, operate through inadequate nutrition, bad housing, child labor, medical neglect, and retarded physical growth; they undermine vigor and vitality, and shorten the useful span of life. But these are not the only or even the most serious effects; poverty also leaves its destructive imprint on the outlook of the individual, his attitude toward society, and the inner motivations of his life.

The rapid decline which has been occurring in the birth rate provides an especially powerful reason for special consideration of children. When birth rates are falling children become the most valuable and the most important of national resources. When, as is now the case in the United States, the decline in the birth rate is uneven among various social and economic groups in the population, there is every reason to look closely at the circumstances in which the citizens of the future are being reared. The problems of differential fertility have in the past been bones of contention between those who lay special emphasis upon heredity and those who stress the influence of environment. But the larger political implications of differential fertility have not received consideration commensurate with their importance to the future welfare of our Nation.

The extent of this neglect is disclosed in a study of family composition undertaken by the Social Security Board. The study is based on an analysis of the schedules recently obtained by the U. S. Public Health Service in conducting the National Health Survey. The original schedules, generously made available to the Social Security Board, were obtained from a house-to-house canvass during the winter of 1935-36 in 83 cities scattered among 18 States. The surveyed cities and families were selected so as to give a population sample representative of the urban population of the United States. In these cities, more than 700,000 households were canvassed, including over 930,000 families with more than 2,500,000 individuals. Of these 930,000 families, information on incomes was available for about 890,000. Among these, 16 percent had been on relief at some time during the 12 months preceding the survey date; nearly 28 percent were in households with a family income of less than \$1,000 a year, and 22 percent were in households with family income of \$1,000 to \$1,500. Two-thirds of the families had incomes that were inadequate to support families of substantial size.

Income distribution is even less favorable among the 337,000 families with one or more children under the age of 16. Among these families, 22 percent reported having received relief, 23 percent had family incomes of less than \$1,000, and 23 percent had incomes of \$1,000 to \$1,500. Thus more than two-thirds of these families with young children had incomes insufficient for a minimum standard of healthy and decent living.

The statistical picture is still less favorable when the distribution of the children is considered. Of the 650,000 young children in the 337,000 urban families having such children, 27 percent of those for whom income information was provided were in relief families, and at least 22 percent were in families with annual incomes of \$1,000 to \$1,500. In other words, 71 percent of the child population was in homes with incomes which, by well-established standards, were inadequate or only barely adequate to provide the minimum necessities for those growing children. By contrast, only about 1 percent of the child population was found in families with incomes of \$5,000 or over.

The family-composition study of the Social Security Board shows, further, the special economic handicap suffered by children in broken homes, as contrasted with children in homes with both parents. In families with both husband and wife, 24 percent of the children were found in relief families; 21 percent in families with an annual income of less than \$1,000; and 24 percent in those with an annual income of \$1,000 to \$1,500. That is, nearly 70 percent of these children in unbroken families were in families with incomes of less than \$1,500 and with an average membership of about 5 persons. By contrast, in families with the mother only, in which nearly 10 percent of all the children were found, almost half of the children (47 percent) were in relief families; 29 percent were in families with incomes of less than \$1,000, and 12 percent were in those with incomes of \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year. Almost nine-tenths of these children in fatherless families were, therefore, in families with insufficient income for proper child development.

The schedules of the National Health Survey also include data on families in 23 rural counties in 3 States. The income data for rural families have many special limitations, but they are suggestive in that they tend to corroborate not only the data obtained from the urban sample but also the data derived from other studies of rural families as to the extent to which children are growing up under economic handicaps.

The provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children have served to mitigate somewhat the economic needs of children in broken families. During March 1939, 678,000 children were assisted under this program. The extent to which children are concentrated in families with means barely sufficient for subsistence underscores the significance of further measures which have been proposed, among them an increase (from one-third to one-half) in the ratio of Federal matching funds for State programs of aid to dependent children and provision of benefits for the dependents and survivors of workers who come within the scope of our Federal system of old-age insurance.

Wide public concern has been expressed, and with justification, concerning the economic plight of the aged. Relatively little attention, however, has been given to the economic circumstances in which today's children are growing up, though the economic plight of the children is far more serious with respect to the numbers of individuals involved, the extent of their economic distress, and its importance to the future of the Nation. In the large and representative

sample of the urban population covered by this study of family composition, children under 16 were five times as numerous as persons aged 65 and over. More than one-fourth of the children, as compared with only about one-sixth of the aged, were in relief families in the period covered by the survey; that is, the 12 months preceding the survey date in the winter of 1935-36. Among all persons in families with relief status nearly 37 percent were children, whereas less than 5 percent were aged.

As this study progresses and we probe more deeply into the statistics, we shall discover the relations among many factors bearing on the composition of American families. However, from the analyses which have already been completed, it is evident that the children are the economic orphans of our society. The plight of the children is a challenge to the Nation.

GERTRUDE VAILE. There is one problem that I have not heard mentioned, the problem of working children in their 'teens, supporting their families while the fathers are unemployed. It seems to me that is one of our most vital problems. It certainly reverses relations between parent and child and does many very critical things.

THE CHAIRMAN. Miss Vaile, may I add to that a reference to the problem of the adolescent who supports the family and retains practically nothing for his labor.

WILLIAM E. COLE. The age span between 16 and 18 appears to us to be a rather critical one, inasmuch as public-school education leaves off at about 16 and usually industry will not accept a boy or girl until 18, sometimes later. I think we should consider ways and means of meeting that problem, helping to extend aid to that group.

CHARLES F. HALL. Did I understand you to mean that there should be provision for those from 16 to 18? In Minnesota an attack was made on the legislature for trying to reduce the maximum age for assistance from 18 to 16. Minnesota now grants aid to children under 18 years of age. There was a very strong attempt to reduce that. I pointed out to the legislative committee the fact that there was no other provision for a child 16 to 18 and that a child 16 years of age had not completed high school.

BENJAMIN GLASSBERG. In a State with which I am familiar, a conference was held recently on crime control, and in the announcement for that conference it was stated that most crime flows out of mal-adjustments to social and economic conditions, that they would probably continue for some time, but there was nothing a conference could do about it. Therefore it was understood that all the papers would be confined to questions of procedure. I take it that Dr. Falk's paper indicated to us that we must do more than concern ourselves with procedure. There are certain fundamental things to which we must give our attention if we are to assume that they will always continue. No doubt our conference can include the procedures that we will follow and our work will bring about that result, but it will leave the basic problems very much as they are.

I would like to suggest, as one of the matters that should be discussed, the question of strengthening the opportunities for the growth and development of trade unionism, so that in turn the wage level may receive the necessary boosting that it must get in order that some of the two-thirds of our children may be raised a little bit higher

in the economic level. I would like to suggest further that we attempt to find out to what extent children are members of families where the father is working full time but where the earnings are inadequate and therefore there is necessary, in addition to this full-time work, relief from relief agencies. Then I would like to emphasize the problem of rehousing America, rural and urban.

Louis I. DUBLIN. The last thing I want to do is to minimize the importance of the economic situation as it confronts the lives of children and I have no thought whatever of undermining the fundamental value of the figures that we have heard from Dr. Falk. I cannot help feeling, however, that the picture that he painted is too gloomy to be true. I do not believe that we can or should assume on the basis of the figures he read that we are confronted to the tune of two-thirds of our American families with a situation where children cannot grow up except with grave hazards. I know that those who continued that survey which produced the basic materials are not entirely satisfied that those urban families are a true cross section of our urban population. I think one wants to be sure that the families actually quoted are a random sample of our population. I am not convinced. Secondly, there is an assumption which Dr. Falk frankly made, and that is the crux of what I want to say, that all families whose incomes are under \$1,500 a year are families which should give us grave concern so far as the lives of children is concerned. That may be correct, but I think we are all entitled to proof. I think we should be on safer ground if instead of making an assumption of that sort we conducted a careful investigation of the actual conditions in families in the \$1,000 to \$1,500 level. I think the family economy, the skill of the housekeeper, and a host of modifying circumstances may affect the character of the life of families on that level, that is, between \$1,000 and \$1,500.

It ought not to be necessary for us to make a blanket decision that all families on the \$1,500 level and lower are necessarily families maladjusted to social and economic conditions. I think that should be definitely proved by a careful and authoritative investigation as to how those families are actually fed, whether they have medical care, whether there is malnutrition, whether families of that type cannot afford the necessary schooling or clothing or whatever it is of the necessities of life which affect the welfare of children. If we can do no more than this, make provision for an adequate study on the spot of the conditions prevailing in such families, we should then have a safe footing for our discussions and for our conclusions and later for our recommendations. Perhaps there is information of the type that supplements the information given by Dr. Falk. I am not aware of it. If there is that type of information, we should certainly take advantage of it. If we do not have that information, our first job is to get it.

HILDEGARDE KNEELAND. I would like to say that fortunately there is information available that shows how American families average in their expenditures and incomes, adequate or inadequate as they may be. As Dr. Williams of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Dr. Stanley of the Bureau of Home Economics know as well as I, about the same time that the National Health Survey was conducted, from which Dr. Falk's figures came, another national survey was

conducted under WPA auspices, the Study of Consumer Purchases. That study also took a random sample of families within the communities selected, covering farms, villages, and cities of various sizes. The income distribution shown by that study bears out the results of the National Health Survey.

The National Resources Committee has made an extension on a national basis from the figures collected by the two bureaus, and we also found that two-thirds of the American families in 1935-36 received incomes of less than \$1,500 a year. Fortunately also, that particular study obtained information from about 62,000 of those families, farm, village, and urban, as to how the incomes were spent, and we have information on the medical care that they were able to get, the diets they were able to get, and so forth. At income levels up to \$1,500 the families were not on the average able to spend for medical care as much as \$60 a year. At the income level from \$1,250 to \$1,500, the average expenditure of all families, rural and urban, based on the sample data, was about \$57 a year. If you recall the estimates of the minimum cost of adequate medical care presented by the Technical Committee on Medical Care and included in the President's message on health security, the minimum cost, even if medical care were purchased on a group basis, was, as I recall it, \$25 a year per person, or \$100 per family.

ELISABETH CHRISTMAN. I just want to know how far a fraction over \$28 a week will go, because \$28 and a fraction is the weekly part of \$1,500 a year and I for one do not need an inquiry to know what that will buy for the American family.

MARY JEANNE MCKAY. I would like to express approval of a study of the distribution of child population and income for child care. We must have a thorough understanding of our whole economic picture. I feel that if we could have some study of the total funds available for public-welfare agencies and contrast that with the amount spent on child care, it might be revealing and helpful, for instance in making future recommendations. Some of us who are concerned with student problems were distressed when schools in the western States were closed because of the heavy toll of old-age pensions. I think material along that line would be very revealing for future study.

Another thing which has not been mentioned is a closely related topic on economic opportunities; that is, money that is being spent to train young people for future employment. What opportunities are there for children in the way of vocational guidance? This will, of course, lead us into a study of employment opportunities for young people who will soon reach the age of 16 and must find employment.

I think we must also consider young people who not only must be clothed and fed and given medical care but must go to school. Education is so inextricably bound up with our economic opportunities that I feel we must give some attention to statistics that will show us how much we are putting into the education of young people whom we expect to carry on our kind of democracy. I think, too, that recreational opportunities as well as educational opportunities should be considered.

ROBERT C. WEAVER. I would like to go back again to the question of Federal income and make this suggestion. It seems to me that

when we get into detailed fields and start talking about a program of public housing—I am thinking of housing because I happen to be in the housing field—we come up against a question, not of the proportion of families having incomes below a certain amount, but of the income structure among the families that fall below that figure. In other words, a housing program such as our present one, with our present type of subsidy, touches a specified group, beginning at a certain income level, and under statutory requirements not exceeding a certain other level. It is important to know by regions how many families there are between those levels. Cost of living very often differs, especially between urban and rural populations, so it seems to me that in relating our income data to any program, it is necessary to break those data down into rural and urban figures as well as data by regions. I think that is one of the difficulties incident to many programs: the fact that a program is designed to meet a certain income group or a certain group in the population and very often it is not restricted in its interpretation to that group. Frequently it is criticized on the basis of the whole need rather than the need of the specific group for which the program was designed.

FAITH M. WILLIAMS. I want to comment further on Dr. Dublin's question about the interpretation of our income figures. It seems to me that one of the things this committee is going to want is a special summary for the benefit of the conference of the recent studies being made of the distribution of families according to income, particularly as that throws light on the situation of children.

I have figures here for Chicago, but they are borne out by the figures for other communities covered by studies showing consumer purchases. They show that the average number of persons in the relief families was 4.3 and the average number in the families that had not been on relief was 3.5.

I notice that suggestions that have been made for our procedure divide themselves into two parts. The first is a description of what we know now about the economic and social condition of children—that is, distribution of child population according to income and family standards of living, urban and rural. It seems to me that it would be very useful to have specific suggestions as to what is wanted from the conference by way of a description of the status quo and then a separate set of suggestions as to what should be covered by a program.

THE CHAIRMAN. I think that is a useful suggestion for consideration here. I have allowed a little latitude about the question of whether \$1,500 is or is not sufficient, although I think the real point is that we should consider that whole subject as something which we want the conference to consider in detail. The question now is not whether the figures that Dr. Falk presented are subject to any exceptions or challenge. The point made so far, I take it, is that the figures presented by Dr. Falk are interesting and stimulating and very much worth our consideration, but we may need further figures and further verification of those figures as we go along. Our discussion, then, does not concern the validity of the figures themselves at this point, but rather the question of whether those figures and the things that lie behind them in terms of family life constitute a problem for discussion during the coming year.

T. ARNOLD HILL. I think all of us can recall how many standards we have in various departments of living and how difficult it is to get those standards over into certain types of homes and certain types of families. I would like to see come out of our discussion today for the agenda of the conference a further discussion of the procedure by which we in the States and local areas can more easily get over to the rural areas and the small towns the information that ought to be made available to them. I doubt if the areas know what is available in the national health agencies and other agencies of the country. I would suggest that we put on our agenda a consideration of the procedures whereby information might be more easily disseminated to the rural and small-town areas. We might explore whether or not we have a sufficient number of libraries—rolling libraries—that go to the children in the rural areas. We might inquire as to whether or not we have enough busses for the school children so that they can go to school. In other words, all of the fine standards which we have built up through the years finally sift through to the smaller communities where much of the problem is.

H. JOSEPH JACOBI. I like your suggestion that we should look at our troubles with the long view and try to get something that we can do about them with a close view, and the remarks I am going to make are along those lines. First of all, I think it is important for the Planning Committee to get information about the various sections of the country, detailed information. I can only speak for the State of Louisiana. I was born and raised there and I know quite a bit about it. I made a study, while I was doing graduate work, of a group of swamp families, people living 90 miles from the city of New Orleans, away out in the swamps, people whose income was \$300 a year, on the average. Among those families you had all the things that develop from such a low income; lack of education and sickness and all the rest. The biggest part of that study, the thing to which I devoted the most time, was the endeavor to get the mothers and fathers to tell me what they wanted for their children in the way of education and economic security. The things that they said boiled down to the fact that they wanted their children to have at least enough education so that they couldn't be cheated. They felt *they* were being cheated out of social security, old-age assistance, simply because they could not defend their rights. I mention this study because among that group of children there were a number who wanted to go to the urban centers because they felt they would have greater opportunities there. I work in New Orleans. I direct the Catholic charities there and I know a group of young trained persons who have been trained in commercial schools and so forth, but they can find no employment. If the people from the country are going to come in and add to that group, the problem is not going to be solved. The ambition of the people in the swamp group is to have \$500 a year clear and they think that if they could get that much with their little truck farms and their chickens and so forth, they could live like kings. They want their children to stay there. If we can get ways of keeping people who are in the rural districts adequately housed and gainfully employed and living at a level that will satisfy them, we will take a step forward.

With the education of the country as a whole, the South is also being educated, and our standards and our aspirations are rising proportionately, so that what might have been all right 50 or 60 years ago is not a just estimate of what we need today, nor is it in conformity with the general feeling of some of us that we should increase our economic abilities or facilities and live on a plane approaching that of our northern brothers.

O. E. BAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana has brought up something very significant. We have two philosophies of life and if you are hoping to have the farmers keep on farming, you have to have a rural philosophy and an urban philosophy.

COLEMAN WOODBURY. I want to say something about housing and the program of this conference. I believe it is right to say that even a distinguished and enlightened audience such as this probably does not realize the extent to which housing has progressed, or at least moved, during the past 5 or 6 years. I have been in it full time for 7 years and in that length of time I have seen housing for poor families with low incomes go from the stage in which we relied upon the Minimum Dividend Corporation, through a stage of the minimum of public assistance, and a stage in which we were building Federal projects, to the present stage in which the United States Housing Authority is making loans and subsidies for local agencies that are trying to do the job.

Perhaps it is pertinent to point out here that there are at the present time in the United States about 225 local housing authorities of one kind or another. About 160 of them have some sort of ear-marking of Federal funds for local housing purposes and about half that number have actual contracts for loans and subsidies with the United States Housing Authority. Those figures are only approximate and are changing, of course, from day to day. Some 20 contracts have been let at the present time for low-rent subsidized projects by these local agencies, and I understand that about the Fourth of July four or five of them will be open for occupancy. It is a program that has been prompted and organized largely on four arguments: First—and this has been the most important, probably—is that the construction of housing will be an aid to economic recovery and will make work. The second is an exposé of the conditions under which people exist in large sections of most American cities. The third is the relation of those conditions to the physical and geographic concentration of diseases—tuberculosis and the like. The fourth is that in those districts in which there is bad housing the costs of public services are high and the incomes in localities and municipalities are low, so that you have a disparity between income and outgo. We have been subsidizing the bad housing and might better subsidize the good. I do not want to go into those arguments in any detail. I think they have been badly stated by the housing experts and burlesqued by the opponents, and perhaps one of the things this conference might do is to examine the validity of those arguments, particularly the last two, as they apply to family welfare and especially to children.

There are four or five points in the present housing scene that seem to me also to deserve the attention of this conference. In the

first place, there is the matter of rents. It is true that under the public program the rents were at first too high. I understand a project in three sections is being opened in Austin, Texas, within the next 2 months, in which rents will average from \$6 to \$8 per family per month; it wasn't very many years ago that we thought that \$6 to \$8 per room per month was doing pretty well, so we are moving in the direction of low rents.

There is also the question of rents for the larger families. There are various ways of attacking that. The thing that is talked about most among the "housers" at the present time is what is called differential renting. It is an English phrase that covers a host of more or less elaborate schemes whereby the rents go up and down with income that is available for the payment of rent. Personally, I have never seen a differential renting scheme that I thought was feasible under most of the conditions existing in this country at the present time. But I suggest that it is something well worth looking into because it links housing directly to the matter of child welfare, and unless we get some workable device for those conditions our housing as an aid to child welfare is going to be much less effective than it might be.

In the second place, I hope very much that this conference will have something to say about the size of units and the use of space that is now being provided in housing. To my mind, the architects have had altogether too much to say about that and some of the other people who know much more about the living conditions and the habits of life that are going to be established and practiced in those quarters have had too little to say.

I think one of the points in the program so far is that housing projects should be considered not only as structures and buildings but as neighborhoods. We recognize that people and families live outside of the houses as well as inside them, and we have tried to provide something in the way of minor recreational areas and the like in the districts in which the houses are built. At first it was assumed that those recreation areas and facilities would be managed by the projects and would be paid for and their cost would therefore be covered by the rents. We came to see that that is a very short-sighted policy, and the trend is all toward getting recreational districts, and school boards, and what have you to take over the operation and maintenance of those facilities, working in cooperation with the management but bearing the expense in the normal way. It seems to me that that subject is one directly related to child welfare.

Finally, we have begun to see that housing is only partially construction, that it is largely management and operation. Among the professional "housers" at the present time, I should say there is a growing consciousness of the importance of trained and skilled management and the part that it will have in seeing that the facilities throughout the 60 or 100 years that they last will provide the maximum services. I hope that the weight of this conference may be thrown behind that movement.

Finally, I want to say that one of the weaknesses of the housing program up to the present time is that it has been predominantly an urban concern. With the exception of a very small amount of work

that was done by the old Resettlement Administration, scattered attempts by local groups, and growing attention to migratory labor conditions, particularly in California and other sections of the West, rural housing is pretty much an unexplored domain of the present generation of "housers." I do not believe that this conference is going to be able to solve all those questions, but I think they ought to be pointed out. As has been expressed many times today, it is not only a question of improving conditions in the places where the children are born and grow up; we have to consider the fact that they do move around the face of the world.

FRANK LORIMER. One of our sister democracies has faced in quite a remarkable fashion a problem that we are facing in this conference. It has developed a program involving many different fields of governmental and private activities, all centered around the question of the trend of population and the particular problems of families and children. For instance, with reference to this particular matter of housing, this country has evolved what it regards as a practical scheme of differential renting, not in relation to size of income, but in relation to size of family. The program in Sweden was adopted 2 years ago. It was thought through with close relation to social science and to the philosophy of democracy in meeting the special needs of families and children. I would like to recommend that careful consideration be given to the Swedish program for families and children and the possible practicability of applying features of this program to the American situation.

OSCAR M. POWELL. I would like to ask a question. Would it be feasible to have done privately or publicly such a job for the balance of the regions of the United States as was conducted by Mr. Odum for the South? I think that is one of the finest pieces of work that has been done in the country. I know it took a lot of time and a lot of money. I think that if public national agencies and State agencies could have the benefit of that kind of material to orient their own thinking and activities, it would be a tremendous advantage to all concerned and I think it would be an advantage not only to those interested in children but to those interested in old people and all those interested in a solution of what seems to me to be a fundamental illness, of which these things we are talking about are more or less symptoms.

The CHAIRMAN. We have discussed thus far two major problems. We have talked about the problem of income and we have talked about the problem of housing. We have left about 45 minutes, and I do not want you all to leave this meeting and say, "The meeting is all over and we only talked about two or three things and I wish we had talked about this and that and the other thing." I should like your instruction as to whether you would like at this point to pick out one or two more subjects and let all of our discussion bear on those subjects or whether you prefer to simplify the procedure and simply let the spirit move each one of us as it has done more or less up to this point and go on in this fashion.

JOEL D. HUNTER. May I ask a question? Suppose you let the spirit move us, if we have any bright ideas in connection with this in the next week, to write them in.

The CHAIRMAN. I assume that the members of this conference are expected to keep in touch with the staff and give us all the bright ideas possible. It is expected that you will do exactly that, and my query was only to use the remaining time in the most valuable way.

RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN. May I suggest, Mr. Hodson, that those who want to talk on new topics be given the opportunity to talk on the new topics. Those who merely want to expound on some phase of the topics already raised here should be asked to give way to those who have new topics to present.

The CHAIRMAN. That suggests to me this proposal. Suppose we allow another 15 minutes for the spirit to move each one of us and at the end of that time let us see where we stand and whether we want to check up and bring out other phases of this discussion and at that point restrict it. I may say that I wish we would not discuss these problems from the standpoint of the content and subject matter and the problems which they present, but only in terms of what would be useful for the group running this conference to put on the agenda for study during the coming year.

Mrs. DOROTHY J. BELLANCA. I think we ought to talk about remedies rather than figures, because we have figures. Whether Dr. Falk is a little bit out of the way with his figures or not does not matter. We still know that there are thousands upon thousands whose earning power does not permit them an abundant life, and it isn't fair to say that perhaps those who have \$1,000 or more a year do not understand values, and therefore do not know how to use that money for proper living. We do know, I believe, that 70 percent of twenty-nine million earn less than \$600 a year, and no matter how much education they get along the line of values, that \$600 will not stretch and give them even the minimum of decent living.

I was very happy to hear the gentleman suggest that greater encouragement for trade unionism ought to be one of the considerations, because after all we cannot speak of child welfare and children in a democracy and leave out the adults, because they have to provide for the children. If the adults are not working and are not earning enough when they do work, they cannot give a proper foundation to the children who are going to grow up and who are going to become citizens of our democracy.

I have some specific examples that I would like to bring forward right here. I believe, of course, that it is essential to encourage trade unionism, because trade unionism works in the direction of a higher standard of living, shorter hours, higher wages. I know that in 1934 when the NRA was a law and when the codes were being formed, the clothing industry that I represented went on a 36-hour week and reemployed in the shops of our nation 15,000 people—workers in the clothing industry. These 15,000 workers who were reemployed because hours were reduced were able to earn and provide for families. The reduction of hours for workmen is a very essential point for the foundation of the family and higher wages. You will find that in industries where workers are organized their earning power is much higher and therefore they are able to provide a better living standard. I believe that we ought to sponsor more legislation, social-security legislation, for workers, for the aged, and for children, as well as broaden and strengthen that which we have already. I believe that

if the suggestions would take that shape and recommendations were made in that direction for the cities, States, and Nation to cooperate in promoting these measures we would be well on our way toward a better life.

W. R. OGG. In considering this topic, the economic foundations of family life and child welfare, it seems to me that we should keep constantly in mind the general topic of the whole conference, the welfare of children in a democracy, with emphasis on the democracy. This conference might well study what are some of the social and economic forces at work which are undermining the foundations of family life in this country, both in rural areas and in cities.

In connection with that, I should like to suggest that certainly the housing problem is one problem, but it is a much broader question than just mere physical housing, especially out on the farm. On the farm it is not merely a question of the kind of house you live in, but the problem of farm ownership. We have seen taking place in recent decades a very large and alarming trend toward tenancy in agriculture, an average of about 40 percent of the farms being operated by tenants, in some States as high as 60 or 70 percent. How can we maintain the security of family life as it should be and the proper standard of living unless we can bring back farm ownership on a practical and enduring basis? Thus there is a much broader problem involved, so far as the rural area is concerned, than the house only, although that is highly important—how to enable young men to get started in farming and stay on the farms, keep their farms, and be able to make a living for their families so they can buy the goods of industry. That is a very real problem with which we are struggling, and it is a problem that affects the welfare of millions of children.

Let us keep in mind also the 40 percent of the young men and women who are born on the farms and go to the cities. It is extremely important to the city that those young men and young women who receive a good share of their education in the rural areas have the proper training.

That brings me to the second suggestion, that this conference might well study the inequalities in our economic system today which create this insecurity that is undermining our family life. Some of these inequalities are economic. Perhaps they are due to the concentration of our industries in the cities. A great automobile industry is concentrated largely in one State. Every community in America contributes to developing that industry, but only one State can tax those resources to maintain schools and other social institutions that are necessary for the training of youth. How can we, as a Nation, overcome these inequalities? Some of them may have grown up naturally. There are other inequalities resulting from policies or lack of policies. Since 1920 there have been about 30,000,000 people living on the farm. They have a lower income, a lower price level relatively, than the rest of the country. They have poor houses. They have poor schools. They have poor health facilities, not because they want to have those conditions, but because of the unequal income status and other economic conditions that bring that about.

How can we bring about, not only on the farm but in the cities, a better balance in our economic structure that will assure greater

abundance to all our families and greater opportunity for children? It seems to me that we will not get very far if we in agriculture take a selfish approach, if industry takes a selfish approach, if labor takes a selfish approach. If we can, we must see the broader need and how interdependent we are, and counsel together as to how we can bring about a fair balance here in our whole economic structure, so as to remove these inequalities of opportunity. I for one believe that the essence of democracy is equality of opportunity and that we can never have the best democracy until we somehow remove these great inequalities. I am confident that if we give thought and study, with all these great groups represented, we can offer some constructive suggestions. It seems to me that somehow we should find some practical suggestions as to how we can cooperate in utilizing our vast resources to bring about a higher standard of living among the great rank and file of our people, both in the city and in the country.

JANE M. HOEY. I would like to suggest that with the limited time and money available before the next conference, perhaps the greatest contribution we could make would be to suggest areas for the collection of basic data on which we could make decisions that would be sound in terms of what can be provided out of public funds in the way of necessary public services. I am thinking particularly that we have only in one or two States now cost-of-living studies, current information with regard to cost of living in those States. It seems to me that some Federal agency could be asked to work out the mechanics and suggest standardized methods to the States so that we may have comparable data.

We have also done a great deal of talking about fiscal capacities of the States and localities to finance these programs, but we have almost no current information on that subject. I would like to suggest that if we could explore those areas of basic information which we need, with regard to both cost of living and fiscal capacity, we might have a basis for judgment as to what we can afford. Until we have basic data as to our needs and what can be afforded in terms of money available, I think we will continue to have an unbalanced program.

Another suggestion is that we might explore the areas where insurance programs or assistance programs might be instituted. Survivors' benefits have been recommended to Congress by the Social Security Board. There are other areas and other needs which could be met by insurance rather than assistance and I would like to have some agreement made that these be explored and some recommendation made by the conference next year.

LINTON B. SWIFT. I want to lay before the Planning Committee or the Report Committee just as briefly as I can one among the many proposals that it might consider by way of exploration. This is the fourth White House Conference. It is different from other White House Conferences in two main respects. One is the title, Children in a Democracy. The second is that the period since the last White House Conference almost exactly coincides with 10 years of depression, 10 years during which there has been an average of between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 of our working population unemployed, 10 years in which approximately 20 to 25 percent of the breadwinners in this country have been without jobs.

Doesn't that situation pose for us a peculiar obligation of this White House Conference to arrive at some kind of an evaluation of what happens to children in a democracy in which 25 percent of the breadwinners are unemployed? Have we any data or any basis for judgment or analysis or evaluation of what has been happening to children during this particular 10-year period between these two White House Conferences?

We know a good deal about what happens to children in certain situations, to adolescents, those who are getting out of school and looking for jobs. We have a good deal of statistical information. But what has been happening in the families of the unemployed and the tensions which have there pressed upon young children in their formative years? What has been happening, as was very tentatively suggested a while ago, to those children who have been forced to become wage earners at an early period and to supplant the regular breadwinner before he was genuinely incapacitated?

CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN. I would like to add just one thing to what Mr. Swift said. What happens to children whose families have been supported, who have never known what self-support means, and what kind of democracy will we have with that kind of children?

DOROTHY C. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, that relates very closely to the problem which has concerned me for a long time, namely, that we might examine some of the things that are in the area of policy and procedural opinion, as well as those things that arise out of our knowledge of facts. It seems to me obvious from our discussions today that we would like, through this White House Conference, to make it clear that children need food and that food should preferably be provided by wages, but it should be provided in any case. The thought that at present occupies me is that out of the experience of the past 10 years we may find a method of providing maintenance for children, and adults for that matter, that does not destroy their souls and perhaps their relationship to this democracy.

I think that when we have lived through a period when people have been able to live more securely on relief than they did on wages, we have to face the practical possibility that in spite of our best efforts we shall not be able to provide within the span of years immediately ahead of us an independent source of livelihood for whatever the number of children is who are now growing up in homes where income is inadequate, whether it is inadequate with relief or public assistance or without relief or public assistance. My hope is that we can do something, as a result of this conference, to insure that those security measures which we provide shall not be hampered by our prejudice against providing for people whom we would like to see provide for themselves, and that the lives of children and adults shall not be thwarted by these prejudices which seem to be characteristic in our economy. If we are going to have to provide for people, as I believe we will in increasing numbers, out of funds which they themselves have not earned, then we shall have to devise methods of making that provision in ways that will not be destructive to their spirits.

I would hate to give the impression that we have made no progress in that direction. I think heroic things have been done by individual case workers going into the homes of dependent families. But I think their philosophy, their procedures, their methods, are not under-

stood generally, nor are they always supported by the administrations within which they work. In a day when we are hearing more and more about publication of the lists of recipients of assistance and all manner of other punitive measures designed to make more difficult the lives of people who perforce are living on unearned income, we have some obligation through this conference to direct our attention and our skill to the devising of methods which will not only avoid thwarting the lives of the people that we help but will actually utilize this help which a democracy provides to renew their relationship to it and to make it more rather than less effective.

Miss VAILE. Would it be desirable for this conference to explore a bit the subject of family endowment, the family wage? During this last year I was in New South Wales, Australia. There the basic wage is set on the basis of man, wife, and one child and there is a regular allowance for each child beyond the first. There is the same thing in New Zealand. There are experiments of that sort in France. I do not know how valuable all this is; I do not think they were working it out very satisfactorily there. But all the figures that we have show that the relief family is larger than the nonrelief family, and that the large family is penalized all the way through in the low-income groups. Should we consider that and the solutions other countries are experimenting with in the field of family endowment?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think, Miss Vaile, that we might also profitably consider the question of whether unemployment insurance ought to be provided in terms of the need of the individual family rather than in terms of fixed benefits regardless of size of family? I am talking now about unemployment insurance as a flexible instrument rather than an inflexible instrument.

Mrs. KENNETH F. RICH. In connection with economic problems of special groups, there is someone in the conference membership who has a special contribution to make, Dr. Paul Taylor, from Berkeley. Dr. Taylor has some very excellent studies of the economic position of the Mexicans in Texas, Michigan, California, Illinois, and other States. I wish we might ask Dr. Taylor to provide an annotation of studies on the Mexican children, especially in relation to health and education and the like.

MARTA ROBERT DE ROMEU. I am not going to make any suggestions, but I want to make a recommendation to this committee, as a message to the Report Committee, that whatever is done to help the children of continental United States by this conference be extended to Puerto Rican children.

Msgr. RYAN. The problem of migrant families has been mentioned a number of times during the day and it is most encouraging to have it mentioned. Many of the problems that are involved in migratory labor are caused by residence requirements imposed by States and localities. My suggestion to your committee is that this conference consider the handicaps placed upon children because of residence requirements imposed by our political subdivisions, the handicaps to education, to medical care, to relief, and the like imposed because of residence requirements which do not allow the free movement of people within this democracy. An analogy may be made between the settlement laws and residence requirements and the trade barriers which are receiving so much attention. The trade barriers tend to

defeat our local principle of democracy by establishing too many barriers at State lines. The same thing happens with settlement laws. They do not allow the free movement of people. That is reflected in child life, and I would like to see our report finally contain some analysis of the handicaps that are imposed on child life because of residence requirements.

Mrs. H. JERRY VOORHIS. I want to say a word about Mr. Powell's suggestion. It seems to me that that is a very practical suggestion for a conference of this kind: to divide ourselves up into sections covering different sections of the country—since there are representatives from every State, both specialists and lay people like myself—and study the economic conditions of our section, just as Dr. Odum did for the South, then coordinate the suggestions and make our recommendations on that basis. I would suggest that if that does seem practicable to the Chairman, we try to enlist the help of labor groups, for instance, and trade-union groups in New York or sections in which they are most important, and also farm groups, and get their suggestions and their recommendations. It seems to me that we might work out something that would be quite useful in a practical way.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would like to see local groups in various parts of the country discussing the things that we are talking about here?

HOWARD R. KNIGHT. I want to propose a question to which this group through the coming year can perhaps give some consideration. I believe if some of the older children and young people in whose interest we are meeting here today could be with us and propose some of the questions that they would like answered, one of them would be, "Can you, from your experience, tell us how, at the present time and in the next decade, we can establish on a sound economic basis the families and the homes we want to establish now or during the next decade?" I hope the committee can give some consideration to that question.

Dr. JACOBI. May I remind you that it has been brought out today that our democracy is founded on religion. I am not going to preach, but I want to point out in this session that the only sound economic foundation of any society must be moral and religious opinions. In considering the economic foundations of the family and the children we must take in such moral considerations as the one brought out a few minutes ago concerning the man who needs more income because of an increase in his family. I mean the justice of his demand, and the religious angle: to be able to get those things that he needs, to expand religiously and morally because his home is adequately furnished and equipped. I think that angle should be considered if, as it was said repeatedly, our democracy is based upon religious convictions and must also rest upon the principles of justice.

JOSEPH H. B. EVANS. We have been talking about the cost of living and about farm family income. When I heard talk of a thousand dollars as an average, I thought some of you ought to know that there are more than two million farm families whose income in cash does not average \$200 per family. That would bring the national average away down. The tendency has always been to talk in terms of our urban problems, but there are rural slums just as there are city slums. There is another phase of it. The Farm Security Ad-

ministration which took over the work of the Resettlement Administration has been making an approach—purely an experimental approach—to solving some of the problems that we have been discussing. One of them to which we must give consideration is not only raising the home and living standards and developing a better farm life, but developing a community life, bringing about in rural areas something that will serve as an attraction to the farm boy and girl and that will lead him to stay in the rural area. Legislation enacted in recent years has brought a new approach in that money is made available for rural housing—I am speaking now of the Bankhead Act—but always on a scattered and individual basis. We have not built any rural communities since the Bankhead Act came into existence and I think one of the things to which we could direct our attention would be a study of an approach to our rural problems through the development of communities under the Farm Security Administration as contrasted with the efforts that are being made toward the development of scattered farms.

The other point I want to make, which I think this conference should take into consideration, is one that has already been mentioned—the problem of special minority groups. I think we all heard the reference made in the President's speech this morning. I believe that we cannot approach this problem properly unless those of us who are sincerely interested in the problem can approach it with a feeling that the Negro boy or girl is just as much a future citizen of this country as any other boy or girl. We cannot express ourselves in terms of a new democratic leadership unless we think in terms of that Negro boy and girl who are denied equal opportunities, who are denied educational opportunities in certain sections of our country. I certainly sympathize with the gentleman from the South who said that there has been a difference in standards of living for the South and the North, but that the South has reached the point where the people are becoming educated and they want to raise their standards and be on a plane with the others. The same is true with the Negro. He has always been lower down in the scale of living, but education has come to him and he, too, is stepping up just a bit and wants to be included among the citizens of our whole United States.

DR. WEAVER. I would like to add one word to what has been said in regard to minority groups. If the purpose of social reform is to create greater equality in opportunity in the democracy, and if the administration of these measures is decentralized and placed in the hands of local communities, in which minority groups, the Negro in particular, do not have an opportunity to participate in political life, there is danger that unless certain safeguards are included in the legislation that is set up the social-reform measures may result in greater differences between the racial groups rather than in equalizing opportunity. I think that is one thing this conference should study.

ARTHUR RAPER. It seems to me that in democracy the matter of participation is perhaps more important than anything else, and the fact that two-thirds of the children are coming from the poorer group, particularly from the South, is extremely significant, in addition to what was said here a minute ago: that these families who have the most children do not vote. It seems to me that there is some responsibility for this conference to take cognizance of the poll

tax, for example. It is peculiarly important, it seems to me, that we give some attention to the framework of our government.

CLEO W. BLACKBURN. I think there are a few other things that ought to be considered in our thinking as a committee. In the first place, I think that in addition to considering the standards of living we ought to consider some of the broad sociological implications that are involved from the standpoint of the morale of the children and from the standpoint of the individual interest on the part of family members. Another thing is the fact that perhaps we will not be able greatly to shift the incomes of all of these people within the next 150 years. I think that some attention should be given to the budgeting of family income properly and realistically.

MR. HUNTER. Two or three of the people that have spoken have intimated that we should be concerned with democracy as well as with children. Monsignor Ryan has spoken of residence requirements. Now, there is one other thing which I hope will be included in the study of children in a democracy—whether the children are better served if the administration for this, that, or the other thing is local, State, or Federal; what the relationship should be between these various governments, in both financing and administration. It seems to me that one of the reasons why our democracy is sometimes extremely inefficient is that we leave so much responsibility to the local government, and I think that general subject is something which might be considered.

CLARA H. KRAUTER. I am going back to what Miss Kahn said because I find myself a little appalled by the picture she painted for us of people more or less permanently relegated to living on money which they did not earn. I would rather substitute for that an examination of the possibilities, for the group dislodged from private industry, of cooperation among themselves to produce the things they need, the old idea of self-help which has never had a fair trial in this country. I think if we are going to have, as we seem to be going to have in this country, inroads in the area of private initiative in business from the top in government, it has to be balanced by further incursions on private initiative from the bottom, through producer-consumer cooperatives and credit unions.

H. DEWEY ANDERSON. We are doing things out in California, in line with what the last speaker said, that I think ought to be brought to your attention. An attempt is being made to get at the fundamentals, to determine what can be done. It is just as complex as unemployment. There is a problem of enormous national resources and developed plant capacity that are unused. We realize that there are many social and allied problems in developing a program of production for use. We think they are not fundamental, however, and we have attempted in the past 4 or 5 months to get special legislation that will enable us to formulate, on a State-wide basis, a program of housing for the underprivileged and of production projects and units of many kinds. We have found industry unusually cooperative. We have found plants, for example, that are being operated at a third of capacity, the overhead eating them up. The plant owners say to us: "We will go in on a production basis with you and you take over the other two-thirds and operate the plant and distribute the goods thus produced among the unemployed." We have

laid down as a principle of aid to the unemployed the platform that our society, our particular State, is obligated to provide work that will enable these people whom industry has cast aside, or who were not employed, to earn their own living. But we have laid down as the other principle that we are not committed to, nor will we continue any longer than is necessary, a dual type of relief in California.

We have launched rather bravely on the new course. We have created a government commission in which some of the leading economists of the country are working together with business and professional men. They are studying the problem so that as we analyze our cases and determine who the people are that are on relief, we are going to be able to fit two and two together and actually get at the fundamentals of the problem. We believe that if we ever solve the economic side of the problem, at the same time not closing our eyes to the social side, the matter can be carried to some kind of conclusion.

BERTHA McCALL. I am not clear as to whether this conference is to take into consideration only those questions relating to the part of government as government in the welfare of children, or are we to try to coordinate the evidence that many private groups are providing throughout the country regarding the same problems that we are talking of here. As I think of a democracy, I think of the private groups and individuals back in our localities in the States and throughout the country that are also interested in many of these problems. Are we going to coordinate those efforts with the governmental efforts?

THE CHAIRMAN. I think I can answer that question rather authoritatively from the discussions that I have heard so far. It is the distinct desire of the planning group, and I am sure it is also of all the members of the conference, that we think of our problem not only in terms of public agencies but also in terms of private agencies. The question is, what services are available? That is a part of the story and obviously that means the inclusion of private agencies. We have had a good deal of discussion lately about the use of words and slogans in achieving results, in influencing public opinion in terms of propaganda. I have been thinking as we talked here that if we had a cross section of those people who make up the Gallup poll and asked them regarding each of the points that have come up, it would produce very interesting, if not too significant, results. But the thing that occurs to me is: Might we not with profit undertake to study during the coming year what are the misconceptions and the prejudiced attitudes with respect to this problem of unemployment and relief, public assistance, and social security? If we knew and could state with a reasonable measure of definiteness and authority what people think is true that we know is not true, we could point up much of what we are trying to do. The 1909 conference made a great contribution of one idea that has been hammered home times innumerable—that home life is the highest and finest product of civilization and that we ought to keep people in their homes and everything should be geared into that. And what an impression that one idea made!

A part of our task, it seems to me, is to combat a very substantial amount of misunderstanding and prejudice with respect to all of the

things we have been discussing this afternoon. Each of us, I am sure, will agree that the truth, so far as human beings ever know it, is terribly important in relation to our responsibilities and in relation to our consciences. But from the standpoint of our program, what people think is true is equally important. We must, in connection with all of the things that we have been talking about here, find out what people think is true and combat the part of it that we know is false. I think we should consider the possibility of framing our conclusions and our recommendations in the light of those things. For instance, what harms relief more than anything else is the idea that "people on relief won't work." There is a poll on that subject reported this morning in the New York Times. It is all a part of this tremendous misunderstanding and misconception. Perhaps one of the things that we can do is to help combat that prejudice and misunderstanding.

PAUL U. KELLOGG. I only hope that any slogan which this conference produces would be more effective than the one mentioned. We have had more migrant families since 1909 than we ever had before in our history. I hope from now on the slogan will be more suggestive.

One suggestion I have not heard is in connection with the endowment of large families. It was suggested that what we have been doing under the National Youth Administration is our first step in carrying forward the idea of opportunity for education for everybody in the American democracy. Mrs. Krauter pointed out that in negation of our democratic ideals, many families are living on money they did not earn. But most of us were educated on money we did not earn. It came from our families first and then when we went to school it came from the State. Can we do something in extending this idea of making an endowment to young people in their creative years so that more of them can equip themselves? That would cut off undeveloped persons from the labor market for the time being and it would certainly equip many more persons. I think it is a more rational approach to the idea of endowing family life than an approach on the basis of the number of children.

ANGLEY PORTER. Our discussion has been from the point of view of the underprivileged entirely. I wonder whether a conference such as this ought to omit a very frank consideration of the privileged group, from which we have a right to expect leadership and statesmanship and from which we get so little. We do now have a governor or two coming from the families that are rich. Perhaps we ought to be able to raise more people from that group. There may be something the matter in this democracy with the handling of that group that fails to provide us with the product that we ought to have, both in government and in private philanthropy.

MARY ANDERSON. In the discussion this afternoon we got into the question of the family and the wherewithal which the family had to do things for its children. I think this is a new approach and it seems to me that this conference might be brought to discuss the family in its entirety rather than just children in a democracy.

Section 3: The Development of Children and Youth in Present-Day American Life

Chairman: Ruth Andrus, Ph. D., Chief, Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education, New York State Department of Education

EXCERPTS FROM DISCUSSION

The **CHAIRMAN**. As you know, the subject of the discussion this afternoon is the growth and development of children and youth in present-day American life. We hope to conduct this group in the democratic way of discussion. That will perhaps imply a little speech making, but just as little as possible, to support one's point of view. We want a free and open discussion, everybody contributing, because that is why we are here at this conference.

The relation of this discussion group to the other discussion groups is, I think, this: We are not supposed to define and set off our discussion group from the others. It will be entirely to the advantage of the conference if we list and discuss issues which are similar to those which are being discussed in the other groups. No one need fear overlapping, since it tends to strengthen the situation rather than to weaken it.

As a preface to the first question which I should like to propose to this group, as a starting point of our discussion, I should like to read a very brief quotation from Thomas Mann's "Coming Victory of Democracy," which will only serve to emphasize some of the points brought out this morning. Mann says: "To come close to art means to come close to life, and if an appreciation of the dignity of man is the moral definition of democracy, then its psychological definition arises out of its determination to reconcile and combine knowledge and art, mind and life, thought and deed."

We might discuss at length the needs of children and youth, and from any point of view that would be a very uninteresting performance, because we have made so many lists of the needs of children. We can recognize, on the other hand, that the development of children and youth is dependent upon the people and things with which they are surrounded, and the way they feel about those people and things. Tensions, conflicts, and confusion are rife in this environment.

In various ways we can discover what some of the confusions are under which the children are living. In the minds of many democracy is of necessity characterized by confusion and muddling through. It is time-consuming. Dictators give the appearance of solving problems, of eliminating confusion, and of providing work and security. Take it for granted, as we were told to do this morning, and as we wish to do, that democracy is worth working for, and bringing alive for children and youth, can we, as adults, face our confusions and the issues which confront us today in democracies,

and not try to escape them by wars, or the other methods of dictators?

Each one of us is probably acutely conscious of the many dilemmas which arise out of our present culture in families, schools, community agencies, and government, and which affect the growth and development of children and youth. If we can discuss these issues or dilemmas, and bring them into the open this afternoon, perhaps we can make suggestions later as to institutions and agencies, ranging from the family to government—and I do not mean by that from the greater to the less, but from the apparently more simple to the more complex. We may perhaps study, develop, and coordinate their functions so that methods for resolving these dilemmas may be suggested.

The first question that I should like to propose to this group, and my function after that will be only to referee, is what dilemmas, or issues, do you yourselves feel, in our present culture, influence the growth and development of children and youth? The reason I have used the word "feel" is because we need to express our feelings about these issues more frankly even than we express our thinking about them.

GLADYS T. EDWARDS. I am one of the persons who helped to sponsor the conference of which the First Lady spoke this morning. Mrs. Roosevelt mentioned a little smugness on the part of some of the group, and a lack of understanding of the conditions which are faced by other young people and other groups in the United States. That is one of the dilemmas which it seems to me faces all of us and which we must take into consideration in regard to our young people. Some way or other we must find a means by which young people, if they are going to develop democratic tendencies, may understand the things which make democracy and the conditions of other people. I think we must break down some of the sectional barriers between our people in order to develop a consciousness among our youth, among our children, of what other people face.

ALICE V. KELIHER. I think that they have a fear at the present time of what they do not know. We have to be pretty realistic about the community and teacher education; it must precede what we are going to do about youth. There is such a tremendous conflict of loyalties, and such a misconception of what the word "loyalty" means, that when we begin to teach young people to look at the truth, when we begin to tell them and show them in pictorial form and by every means we have at our disposal, what the problem of the sharecropper or the slum dweller is, we immediately get criticism from someone who says, very sincerely, that that is being disloyal to our traditions, that we ought to make our youth think that democracy is working perfectly, and so on. It seems to me that we have to do some working on ourselves as an adult group, and purge ourselves of the notion that democracy cannot be criticized by youngsters, and that they cannot see some of these awful truths, before we can rid them of what is a very serious emotional conflict of loyalties.

JOSEPH W. FICHTER. I should like to suggest a dilemma that I believe our young people face, in schools which are supposed to be preparing them for democracy, and at the same time are not conducted in a democratic way. I think that is most confusing.

SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG. Perhaps, instead of plunging into the problems of youth, we can go back to early childhood, because that is our most dramatic concern at the present time. For during all of the years that lead up to the youth period, in schools and in homes, it seems to me that the greatest dilemma, and the greatest deprivation, at the present time, is the segregation into age groups of young people and children, so that they are not prepared to think with adults or to live with adults. They come from homes that are run for them, in a protective way—I am speaking now of children who are not suffering deprivations of a physical kind. Even with families on relief, there is a certain overprotection of children in some sections. They go to schools that are run for them, and as they stay in school many more months and years than they did in the past, it becomes increasingly difficult for them to live with other people. They have not had a real situation in school, home, or the community through the growing years that would prepare them to take advantage of such opportunities as were pointed out. They have been kept too infantile; we have protected them.

We do not want them to be exploited in labor, but we have protected them to such an extent that work is something terrible to look forward to when you are through being protected. Increasingly, as we meet young people and parents and children, we find the disadvantages of the so-called "privileges" of longer schooling, and even of better schooling, very apparent in their lack of maturity.

MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE. I believe that children within themselves are most democratic, and I think that our difficulty is possibly the attitudes to which children are exposed and the lectures that are given to them by those who are their leaders and instructors. Our democratic spirit must start from the older ones, and then the children will carry it on.

SIDNEY E. GOLDSTEIN. You asked what dilemmas the children today are facing. May I suggest that one of the most serious dilemmas that children today in America are facing is found in the family itself.

May we not give some little time to a consideration of that problem? I noticed this morning that emphasis was placed in every one of the addresses on the family and the home, which is altogether proper in view of the fact that during the past 30 years, or since the first White House Conference, there has been a very marked shift of interest and of emphasis.

In 1909 we were concerned with the child, and about 15 years ago we became interested in the parent, in the belief that we could not do much with the child without educating the parent. Now we are beginning to think not of the child nor of the parent but of the family as the unit, and probably as the basic social unit that we ought to study and understand a little better. Certain things are taking place in the family today that seriously affect the life and the development of the child.

We do know that break-downs are occurring, incredible increases in the number of estrangements and separations and divorces. The last study I have seen seems to prove that out of every nine marriages existing in America today, seven will be dissolved by death and two will be dissolved by divorce, which means that about 20

percent of the families in America today are actually in danger of break-down, or about six million out of the twenty-nine and a half million families in our country. If that be true, we ought to study what is happening in the family in order to safeguard the child a little more carefully, because, after all, the first environment of the child is the family, and what happens in the family seriously affects the life and the development of the child.

Certain changes are taking place in the family today, as all of us know. It is changing in the form of organization, and that perhaps accounts for the point that was made just a moment ago, of the family being democratized.

Certain changes are also taking place in the structure of the family, and that leads to certain conflicts. Changes are taking place in the functions of the family, and again dilemmas. All of those things ought to be studied more carefully with the child in mind. Perhaps it might be helpful if we were to spend a little while in discussing what can be done to meet that dilemma and to assist the child. I hope that we will agree to include within our program, before we are finished, some of the newer programs that are being developed in different parts of the country. For example, it does seem that we ought in this conference to emphasize education for marriage and family life in order that we may have a better family than we have at the present time and that we may prevent the break-downs that are now occurring and damaging the lives of children.

I also think that we ought to emphasize the newer program of family counseling in order that those who are in difficulty may be guided properly in the solution of their problems. That also would help children and youth.

Then perhaps it would be wise for us even in this group to study the impact upon the family of social conditions such as are developing today. I think that all of us would agree that it is practically impossible to rear children as useful citizens in the wrong kind of home, and we ought to consider seriously what is happening to children in the great sections of our cities known as the slum areas. Perhaps we should also take into consideration that you cannot rear a normal family on a subnormal income. I know that that is really a part of the program of another section, but you say that all of them are interrelated. The thing that I want to urge is that in this conference today we focus our attention in part at least on the family and on what is happening to the family and what we can do to safeguard and conserve the family and to make possible a better family life in America for the sake of our children.

LAWRENCE K. FRANK. What has been said thus far can be summed up in these terms: Can we inventory the various organizations and personnel which are doing things to and for the child, beginning with the family, going through the school, youth organizations, recreational organizations, religious organizations, in terms of what they are asking the children to do or not to do? Then find some way of systematically examining the contradictions and the dilemmas that are presented to children. Children usually do not create their own dilemmas; the dilemmas are forced on them and offered to them by the adults who are in charge of their rearing. This suggestion, therefore, is in terms of a general procedure for an inventory of

agencies and persons, ideas and rules of conduct that are being offered to children, from which we can bring out the confusion, dilemmas, and conflicts that have been mentioned by the several speakers thus far.

ARNOLD GESELL. It would be well to formulate the dilemma in terms of the parent—or parents, because there are two of them. The parents are constantly confronted, even though they do not formulate it, with the dilemma of discipline (if they use that word) versus tolerance, and we know that tolerance of the right kind is the very essential of democracy. So perhaps nothing would be more far-reaching in terms of applied mental hygiene than some way of formulating or reformulating this age-old problem of discipline in such simple terms that parents themselves will be in less danger of setting up models that are nondemocratic. Such a construction would then affect parents and child alike, and jointly. Democracy, like charity, begins at home and with the parents.

The **CHAIRMAN.** I think that is a very good suggestion, that democracy is a me-to-you relationship, and not something up in the air. Would you make a suggestion of one way of reconciling or resolving this question of discipline, as compared to freedom or tolerance, because we want differences of opinion here?

Dr. GESELL. I think that takes us into great difficulties. If you want a single key concept that will solve this and a good many other dilemmas, I would suggest the concept of growth itself. In some way parents have to catch the idea not that children must be made good, or merely that they must be made mature, but that there is a complicated, tedious, long, gradual process of maturity, or of growing, which introduces a principle of relativity into all of the problems of home life, and which is not too philosophical for them to grasp. Having that idea of the relativity of growth, they will see problems in terms of immaturity, and of age, and of individual differences. Many parents, of course, carry in their minds models of what they think their children ought to be. If they will take their ground on the idea that individuals, even within their own family, differ, that the great problem in life is to catch those individual differences, to recognize them and to appreciate that every child is different and has an individual pattern of growth, the dilemma may be solved in part at least.

The **CHAIRMAN.** According to your statement of growth there would never be immaturity, would there?

Dr. GESELL. No; there would not.

Mr. FRANK. I think a way of starting this inventory, with what may seem like anarchy, lies in the parent-education field to which I am devoted. We have worked too hard on what parents ought to do to their children, and to make parents do things about their children, leaving the unsolved emotional dilemmas of parents themselves to go by the board. I want to support firmly what has been said, that the tolerant adult is the person who is well adjusted and sufficiently lacking in fears so that he can afford to recognize his child as an individual because it is no threat to him to have his child different, and he can afford to recognize other human beings for what they are because to do so is no threat to him.

I do not know how to do it and I wish some group could help us find a way to take the many threats out of adult life today. I entered

a plea at the beginning that we think not too much about children here, that children are really democratic, they really are individuals who like to grow and like to be active and like to display initiative, and it is something about us cockeyed adults which knocks it out of them. Therefore I wish that this conference could devote a good part of its time to what happens to us, and how we can get ourselves straight, so that we can really afford, inside, without any feeling of threat to our own integrity, to let children grow, and let them be something greater than we ourselves have ever thought of being.

Mrs. GRUENBERG. My idea was not that we should make children mature, but that we should allow them to become mature, and not stultify the whole process to which Dr. Gesell has referred. Of course one of the major difficulties of children is that adults surround them, including teachers, and their whole environment has become so circumscribed. They meet as adults only their parents and teachers, and if they are not democratic and tolerant the child is handicapped in his very development and growth.

SANFORD BATES. It seems to me that one of our underlying dilemmas is our inability, or perhaps our unwillingness, to relate the question of obligation to the question of rights. I hope that as we go through these deliberations we may see child situations in the terms of obligations, and not attempt to define them in terms of what the children's rights are. Democracy, as I see it, imposes an obligation even more than it confers rights. I do not think that we will be doing any particular favor to the children if all we talk about are the rights with which they are born, unless we accompany that with a practice of the obligations which we all owe not only to them but to democracy as a whole.

The right of free speech is an empty right unless somebody has the obligation to listen, and the other rights that we talk about so glibly would get us nowhere if we did not impose certain obligations on ourselves. It seems to me that the worst possible tendency is for us to be emphasizing people's rights all the time. No children can have rights unless other children feel an obligation toward them.

We talk about the right to a pension when we should be talking about the obligation to be frugal. We talk about the rights of the poor to be fed and taken care of, when we should talk about our own personal obligations to be neighborly. We talk about the rights of the children to be given a good home, when we should be talking about our own obligations to provide them with that home, and the things which only a home can secure.

I hope that instead of having a children's charter at this time, which will list the rights of children, we will have a creed which not only adults but children can adopt—a creed which lays out for us our own duties and our own obligations. After all, in a true democracy the greatest right that can be conferred, and the right that is being withheld in nondemocratic countries, is the right to responsibility.

Mrs. J. H. MORROW. It seems to me that this conference should think about the difference in the homes, in attitudes, in schools, and in point of view with reference to rural children and small-town children and city children. They are not the same problems.

The country home and the small-town home are closer to the children and closer to the life of the community than are most city homes. The school is a vital force in that community. Good government the

children know about and talk about and learn. It seems to me that in making surveys and getting results this conference should divide its report so that it covers those classifications. In small towns and in country places the feeling of patriotism for country is much more intense and strong and you have very little trouble with democracy. The little that you have comes through the selection of wrong textbooks in the public schools, where too many subversive textbooks are used. Unless you have an instructor who holds to the right, the children commence to wonder if some of these "isms" are not a little better or just as good, and why should we not do thus and so.

After all, we have a democracy. When we have what we have in America today—above all ideals of tolerance—democracy should be uppermost before the children in schools, and it should be uppermost in homes. Tolerance is all very well, but in ruling your family and in family relationships—spiritual, economic, or any other kind—a little more of the good old-fashioned discipline along with tolerance and growth is the thing that is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. Your suggestion that in a small city people do have more opportunity to become close to the government may be true. You have also raised some very interesting questions.

I would like to have some discussion now of what the group really feels. We are talking about the issues of which adults are conscious, and which they in their organizations present to children. The lady who has just spoken has made evident a kind of authority and discipline which must present an authoritarian family relationship to children that we are bringing up for democracy.

JUANITA JACKSON MITCHELL. I am primarily interested in American youth, the youth period. Someone has said that Horace Greeley, were he alive today, would not say "Go West, young man, go West"; he would be more likely to say, "Go on relief, young man, go on relief." I want to bring up a very concrete and serious dilemma, which our youth are facing—the ever-widening period between the time young people leave school, and the time that they find jobs. They want to use their talents and their abilities and they have no way to use them. I believe that while they have the obligation to use those talents and energies which the schools are supposed to have brought out in them, at the same time democracy should afford them opportunity.

ELIZABETH YERXA. I would like to make a very concrete suggestion in line with the reorganization proposal of the President which for the first time would bring together under one agency, Federal Security, most of the youth-serving organizations now in the Federal Government. It seems to me that we are thinking of long-term planning for youth.

Mr. FRANK. We heard this morning that we need to abandon the one-room school and the small local unit. I am not sure that we as a democratic group should support that because there are times when the local organization, the smaller unit—let us say the family—is the only unit that can solve certain problems. It may be that the community defined by mile, or creeks and rivers and roads, is the most useful unit. How far shall we go in bringing everything under one head? If we do, are we losing something of the personal relationship involved? Are we losing something of the dedication of people to the task that they have at hand?

SIDNEY HOLLANDER. It seems to me that we are discussing mechanics rather than fundamentals. Since the basis of this discussion is democracy it seems to me that beginning at that point we might want to know what the children themselves are thinking about in the way of problems, and what their own ideas are in regard to solutions.

We have with us today Mr. Owen Lovejoy, whose organization recently finished a study of some 13,000 children, in which in my State especially, and I believe in other States too, every one of these children were personally interviewed as to their opinions in regard to the efficacy and adequacy and the results of certain of the factors that come into their lives. They were interviewed primarily on the subject of education, what it meant to them, whether they were satisfied with it, what suggestions they had for making it fit better their particular needs. They were questioned on the subject of religion, on the subject of their relation to their parents and to their brothers and sisters, on the question of job opportunities, on their own feelings about democracy, and what their responsibilities were to democracy. The results of those questions were so striking and so dramatic that it seems to me we might very well take something of that sort as a starting point, and consider what the children themselves think about these problems.

THE CHAIRMAN. I should like to raise the question that Mr. Frank has raised, that we ask the various organizations represented here to list the dilemmas or issues with which they find youth confronted in their work. Then we have this other suggestion of hearing about the issues of which youth themselves are conscious.

MR. FRANK. From the point of view of children, would it be possible to consider the question that has been raised many times, namely the respect for or recognition of the integrity of an individual as a personality. Since there are so many individuals in this group who for years have been engaged in the study of child growth and development, we might ask them to offer reliable methods for assaying what various practices of child rearing are doing to children today, in terms of preserving or destroying their integrity, as organisms and as human beings and personalities.

I think the work that has been done in the development of child research gives us some very concrete and reliable instruments with which we can make an assay of our present-day social life and culture, in terms of what it is doing to human beings. That makes the issue of democracy for children a very concrete and realistic one, because they are not participating as citizens. They are denied the right of expression except insofar as these special inquiries are made. Therefore it becomes incumbent upon us as adults to make an assay of what our society means for human needs and measure the methods and procedures which, though not final or perfect, go beyond what was available in 1930 when we had our last White House Conference.

EDWARD E. STRONG. I should like to present the dilemmas that the young people whom I represent—the Southern Negro Youth Congress, the young people in the South and particularly in the rural areas of the South—face in a democracy.

I think that chief among these dilemmas are the aspirations of the young people and the inability to fulfill these aspirations. First they are taught democracy, so that they desire to participate and to vote, but they grow up without the possibility of voting. They are

taught the idea of democracy and of participating in that democracy but are denied the opportunity to share.

Secondly, they are taught to aspire to an education, to go to school, and they want this. But in the rural areas of the South, the one-room school system is still in vogue. They find it impossible to go to school throughout the year, and to achieve those educational opportunities that they are taught everybody in a democracy should have.

Third, they hear of the steps toward better health, and yet they live in rural areas in the South, in Alabama and Mississippi, where they have no opportunity whatsoever to secure the health facilities that are being told about throughout the country today. They live in communities where venereal disease exists in from 30 to 90 percent of the population. There you have concretely the dilemma of those people who are taught health on the one hand but who cannot achieve it on the other.

Fourth, they face the dilemma of having the cultural aspirations of all American people, the desire for artistic expression, but having no sort of community expression for it, especially in the rural areas. I continue to emphasize the dilemma of young people in the rural areas of the South—no theaters, no chance for drama participation. They have all the aspirations of all young American people, but no possibility of achieving them. The democracy denies them this opportunity, and I think that that is the major, fundamental dilemma of the southern Negro youth.

COURTENAY DINWIDDIE. You asked for something quite specific and concrete. I think one of the things that young people want more than anything else is to express themselves in some creative achievement which will put them fairly on a par with adults. They used to get that in the home, they were brought up for a profession or trade, to take part in some activity that led them into work that was on a par with adults. We wiped all of that out when we built factories, and when we began to employ children en masse in industrialized agriculture. There they are not being trained at all to do anything like skilled adult work, but are being put into competition in routine unskilled jobs in order to keep down wages, which is not at all the same thing. We are eliminating that exploitation partially, but not wholly.

But what are we offering as a substitute for that desire for creative achievement? In most of our homes, and certainly in relationship between our homes and our schools, we use very little imagination in trying to see that the education and training of young people are in relation to situations such as they know adults are called upon to meet or to see that they have opportunity for creative achievements which will raise their status to that of adults.

That is at the bottom of a great deal if not most of the discontent of youth. That thought has been expressed here in two or three ways, principally the lack of jobs and the lack of responsible participation in solving the major difficulties that confront them.

What do we see when the youth get out of school? We see—and I think Mr. Bates will support me—the highest crime ratio for any age group in the population during that first 10-year period after they get out of school. We see also, as I think Mr. Lovejoy will agree,

the highest rate of unemployment in any age group. It is a significant combination, unemployment and crime.

Do you not have there a concrete and specific job to do? It has many ramifications to be sure, but if we can begin back in the home and in the schools to bring to each young person the opportunity to show his ability, to show that he can do things that an adult can do, that he can meet life situations as an adult can meet them, then he will be ready when he steps out of school, not to be frozen out of a job and to accept it as inevitable, but to take a major part in planning for job-making.

I know no community in the United States—if there is such I hope someone will tell me of it—which has together put all of its best thought and planning, with a really lively imagination, in trying to find new and better ways of solving the problems of youth today, including the creation of new forms of employment. Could we have a greater challenge?

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lovejoy, would you give some of the issues that you met in your study which would throw more light on these difficulties?

OWEN R. LOVEJOY. I will be glad to say a word or two in response to Mr. Hollander's suggestion. I think, however, that Mr. Hollander pointed out rather concretely the various areas of discontent and dissatisfaction or questioning or worry on the part of youth as we analyzed them in Maryland and as we have done in other communities. It would be impossible to summarize or to state any position that would be characteristic of the whole group. In fact, that is one of our difficulties in America; we are always trying to lump things and say that youth is this or youth is that, or youth thinks this or that. In addition to the material that we were able to classify into categories so as to chart statistical summaries, we have in our files about 30,000 individual specific responses of these young people that we have yet not had time to analyze thoroughly and classify. A good deal of it cannot be classified, because—fortunately, I think—every one of these youths differs from every other one; each one has his own problems.

In the area that Mr. Dinwiddie mentioned, the large percentage of unemployed, the problem goes back, of course, to the dilemma which young people face, the wide gulf between what they may be able to get when they find a job, and what they would like to do if they ever get a job at all. The fact is that generally speaking they are in a vicious circle, fixed by the occupation and the wage level of the parents, by the condition in which the family lives, by the kind of schooling provided in the particular community, and by the presence or absence of health service in the community—all of the factors that enter into their daily lives tend to fix them as to the future.

I should like to sum up what has been in my mind as I have listened to this discussion today by pointing to what seem to me to be outstanding characteristics of our society in reference to its problems in relation to youth. First is the ideology of poverty. We are still living in that mental and emotional era. We are still thinking in terms of minima. We talk about the minimum wage; we talk about the maximum hours of labor; we talk about the absolute minimum

on which a family can subsist, and when we start out on the programs for children or youth we start out with the bottom instead of the top, as the goal to be reached. We try to abolish illiteracy instead of trying to educate our young people.

If you want to stir up a community to do something for the young people of the community, you get some spellbinder to come to the Chamber of Commerce, or the Rotary Club, or the Women's Club, and make a spirited and red-hot appeal for arousing the community to abolish juvenile delinquency, instead of trying on the other hand to develop such an atmosphere in the whole community as will make it easier and pleasanter to be decent than to be indecent. Instead of trying to train people in the art and practice of social behavior, we start out to chase this small percentage of the youth of the community, as though we were being infested by a band of marauders who are threatening our lives and our property. That characterizes our attitude toward most of our social problems. We are afraid of new ideas, and I think that that carries over into the lives of our children and makes them timid as to the adventures of life.

I said in the beginning that it was impossible to classify either the youth of Maryland or the youth of the country in any generalization. I would say, however, that, roughly speaking, we found in our study there, and in other communities that we have studied, three general types of young people as to their relationship to all of these problems that we are discussing here. On the one hand there is the extremely valuable forward-looking, or wild-looking—whatever you may think of it—group, a small percentage of the total that is very articulate. We hear a great deal from them and about them and a great many adults whose hair is beginning to turn gray or fall out are afraid of all youth organizations for fear they are going to run radical and lead us into something that will be very dangerous.

Over on the other side is a very large percentage of confused, frustrated, disappointed, partly discouraged boys and girls who don't know why they are here, and don't know where they came from, and don't know where they are going. They have no job, they have no possibility of a job; they were cared for by the school system up to a certain date, and the day after they got their diplomas or left school without graduating, nobody in particular seemed to give very much consideration to them.

In between—and here, I think, is our hope—is a fairly large percentage of clear-headed, constructive, ingenious, venturesome young people, who have read the past, who know something about history, and have learned some of its lessons; who know that there are certain things that the race has achieved up to the present time that have to be conserved if we are going to make any further progress, and who are not tied down by that but take it for what it is worth. As St. Paul said, they study all things and hang on to what is good, but they try to go ahead, and they have tried to make it clear to us—and this impressed us more than any other one thing in our study of the group that Mr. Hollander mentioned—they want to convince us that youth is not asking favors; they are not asking to be cared for; they are not asking us to take the burdens off their shoulders; they are only asking us to let them have the opportunity to get their shoulders under the wheel. They are not to be pampered, and they are not

infants to be patronized; they want to be comrades with us in trying to work out a more realistic democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Stoddard, I wonder if you have something to say concerning recent research in the field of family relations.

GEORGE D. STODDARD. I think it is important to mention these results because I do not think that we will get very far in social improvement until we have demonstrated the effect of certain bad techniques. We got somewhere in nutrition when we were able to make rather striking comparisons and demonstrations between children who lacked minerals or cod-liver oil and fresh air and those who had good nutrition, plenty of sunlight and fresh air, and so forth. That kind of information, as it filters down through our schools and our public-health agencies, is a good path from the research of the most technical and obscure type down to what you might call public knowledge.

Let me consider practices within the home, within the family, and within the community. We are not very clear ourselves, for the most part. We do not have as a rule any clear demonstrations that we can understand ourselves, or that our colleges will accept, of the effects, let us say, of a constantly dominating mother, or the effects of long-continued internal dissensions in the home resulting, in about one-fifth or one-sixth of the cases, in the break-up of such a home.

We cannot help feeling that there are effects, knowing what we do about the plasticity of human nature and the dynamic relationships among these social impacts. These children are close to one another and to their mothers and fathers, and they must show the impact of these situations. Usually when we come to demonstrate the effects, however, we do it in dramatic case studies rather than in scientific findings.

It is true, as Mr. Frank has implied, that there are in various places over the country—institutes such as Dr. Anderson's and Dr. Gesell's and our own at Iowa and a few others—some fairly definite and somewhat scientific demonstrations of what goes on. I should refer, for example, to the work of Professor Kurt Lewin of the University of Iowa, who happens to be at Harvard just now. He actually set up a research laboratory in schoolrooms and in the equivalents of schoolrooms, designating some groups as democracies and others as autocracies, and working out rather potent techniques of democracy and of autocracy. The autocracy rather makes us shudder if we know anything about children. We have visitors from all over the Middle West at some of these experiments in autocracy, showing them the different groups. Some of the visitors have gone away feeling that that was just a typical classroom situation. They could not see anything wrong about it; the children were never kicked by the dictator; there was no physical punishment; but the dictators told them what to do and they did it. In the doing of it, however, they became rather unsocial; they became rebellious and lost their ability to learn; and they tore up their co-operative, practical achievements in the making of things. They had no way to distribute them at the end so they threw them in the wastebaskets. In the schoolrooms attempting to apply democracy, the children became more friendly and interested in each other and

put on cooperative projects; they had fewer rebellions, and fewer behavior problems, and fewer references to clinics and psychopathic hospitals. You may wonder how we dared run some of these things, and the answer is that we do not carry the autocracy very far with any one group of children; when we get through with that section we give them a good, strong dose of democracy before we finish the experiment.

I might say for the benefit of Dr. Keliher and some others here who are so deeply interested, that we have found what they have found, that laissez-faire in itself is no good either; you cannot say, "Now, children, what do you want to do today," because a lot of them don't want to do anything. You are not working on a clean slate, but a slate that has been well written on previously, and you have to be much more imaginative and positive in guiding and in offering help. But a democracy where they discuss the problem, and then follow some course of action upon which they can all agree, does lead to good effects.

We have had other experiments similar in type. Some years ago some of our workers discovered that you could change children in their humility, or in their ascendancy, or on the other hand, you could take the bully and with only a few weeks or few months of work on him, of a rather subtle sort, could bring him toward the center of social responsiveness and social acceptability. We found, too, that we could take very timid children and by working on them—we think fairly intelligently—could make them members of the group, participating and helpful and accepted by others as real personalities. I do not know how far you can go with that. I feel that you could go very far if you wanted to as a scientific experiment.

Some work under Dr. Updegraff shows that you can take preschool children who on failure, which is a common experience in their lives, have been accustomed to sulk or show temper tantrums or complete rebellion, and with only a few months of work they can be brought around so that they do not show those tendencies at all and you would think that they had never had them.

I mention these experiments for one reason only. I do not think that a conference like this can be a research conference, and I do not see how a report can have within it very much research, but I do believe that we need a demonstration of the generalizations that we may put forward, and if we say democracy does this better, be pretty sure that it does and under what circumstances and within what limits.

One of the great charges against democracy is that you never can get any quality out of it; it is all quantity, it is inefficient and ineffective. I think that we can show by these experiments and by many others in other institutes that this is not true. Believe it or not, the very highest quality of thinking can come out of what we call the democratic process of conference, discussion, and integration, and we believe we can actually demonstrate that.

Another charge, and one that I do not know how to meet, is that there must be something wrong since so few people have access to these better plans and better programs. What I have mentioned is almost in the stratosphere for most children. Even in our best schools they do not have the programs which I have mentioned.

Consider the gap between our worst country schools, in the South or elsewhere, and what our best schools give to their children! I am convinced that if we can do something, whether it is through support of some distribution-of-wealth plan for education or through some better system of laws, we will take another big step from what you might call the theoretical to the practical type of work. I think that this conference might try a little of that.

CHARLES WILLIAM TAUSSIG. So far most of our discussion has been about democracy. Something has been said about subversive activities. The question of academic freedom has come up and there has been some discussion around the subject of discipline. I doubt whether any of these words mean the same to any two people in this room. I do not for a moment underestimate the importance of arriving at some conclusions on these fundamentals but I feel that, in attempting now to debate these issues at length, we are likely to ignore the major subjects to which this conference is devoted.

Some years ago I attended a conference at Ann Arbor, Michigan, where the subject under discussion was "The Crisis in Secondary Education." In the round-table discussion in which I participated someone asked for a definition of democracy. For 2 days the discussion was devoted entirely to this very important and interesting subject, and not only did we fail to arrive at any conclusion concerning democracy but neither did we arrive at any conclusion concerning the high schools.

If we are to discuss in this room the problems of youth I would suggest that we try to confine ourselves to matters directly relating to their problem. We might discuss the family, the school, and many other things, and ultimately we will arrive at the one subject that interests youth more than any other, that is the question of jobs. I believe that we will all agree here that a major objective for which we all strive is to give a sense of self-respect and dignity to young people and that is almost synonymous with making them self-supporting.

In the National Youth Administration we have learned a number of very interesting facts. One of them is that the average young person, the youth we deal with in the Youth Administration from the age of 16 to 24, inclusive, is quite as competent to do manual work as is the person we call "adult." We checked the work on our projects and found that, under proper supervision—and by proper supervision I mean supervision by experienced foremen—youths between the ages of 16 and 25 were as capable of producing excellent work as adults. In certain parts of the country, using youth labor, we have built stone houses, usually community houses, the youth quarrying the stone and doing the complete job, including the landscaping. In Kentucky we rebuilt or rehabilitated 1,500 rural schoolhouses, using youth labor entirely. The effect on the morale of the young people of this type of work was remarkable. The fact that these young people had tangible evidence that their own labor created buildings which were to be used by the entire community did much to give them a sense of importance and a reason for existence. In such types of activity will be found the answer to many of the questions that undoubtedly will come up before this conference relating to character building and to making better citizens.

I believe it is possible for us to set aside in our economy a specific area in which youth labor will be used exclusively, an area that will compete neither with normal private enterprise nor with organized labor. We might leave to youth, for example, the landscaping of school premises, the building of their own community houses. There is a field in the fabrication of houses that, at the present time, would not conflict with existing activities of adults. There is a whole field of work with which the National Youth Administration has experimented that might well be turned over to youth until they can be absorbed in the general economic order.

It is therefore my suggestion that the conference devote considerable time to an analysis of the whole problem of jobs for youth.

The CHAIRMAN. I hoped that we might have raised this afternoon some of the issues which democracy does raise in relation to the growth and development of children, and thereby get some idea of people's notion of democracy. Leaving things to youth troubles me a little, because I would like to ask, What does youth want left to it? That whole issue, between what youth and children want, and what adults decide that they should have, is one of the issues of democracy, is it not?

JOHN E. ANDERSON. It seems to me that there are two general trends which are coming out in this discussion. One is distinctly the problem of the manner in which modern society fails to meet the aspirations, ideals, and purposes of youth as trained in modern society—that is a very specific and important question with which we might concern ourselves, and the speakers on the youth side of it have emphasized it. We have tended somewhat, however, to neglect the general question which was raised by Mr. Frank, and which can be put, I think, in somewhat more specific terms. If we can arrive at a definition of what we mean by "democracy," so far as adults are concerned, then it seems to me that it is appropriate for us to ask how far the present procedures in the American home, and the American school, and other agencies which affect the lives of growing children, determine the pattern which they carry into this later democratic procedure.

My own feeling is that in many of our familiar practices we are very far from being democratic, and I am absolutely certain that the school is the most authoritarian, the most totalitarian, institution in modern society. I think that any study of the lines of authority which run through the school, and the manner in which whimsies or ideas or policies are transmitted down through that authoritarian chain to the children, would reveal that fact.

What Mr. Frank proposed was that we make some sort of inventory of these specific procedures which we might all agree were relatively undemocratic and try to evaluate them in terms of a conception of democracy which was arrived at by some sort of concensus or agreement as to definition. This is also related to the problem of youth, because we are concerned essentially with this middle group of youth. It has been pointed out that they carry the main load, and so far as the future of our society is concerned it would seem to me that they constitute the most important group with reference to which we need to consider specific practices and procedures developed

in home and school which carry over later into democratic attitudes and democratic approaches to society.

Dr. KELIHER. Replying to the last two speakers, I would like to propose this test of anything we do: Are we using human beings as means instead of ends? Would you put your youth program to the test? Are these young people building roads because roads need to be built and it is a good way to get rid of youngsters who need to spend their time, or are they building roads because it is a part of a growing process with those young people as the end of that process?

As to your test of what is democracy—in our schools is a teacher of a 3-year-old or 6-year-old or 9-year-old or 12-year-old using that person as a means either of expressing himself, getting rid of his own angers or tensions, or projecting upon society something about which he has prejudices? Shall we never use human beings as means, but only as ends?

Dr. STODDARD. It seems to me that Miss Keliher has put an impossible problem. Human beings are always used as means. We live in a social world, surrounded with demands of one sort and another, and it puts pressures upon us, and we cannot develop any theory of training or any program for a democratic society unless we know reasonably clearly the goals of that program. I am perfectly agreeable to a philosophy of society which believes in the development and maturity of basic impulses of the individual, but that is not the kind of society we live in. The kind of society we live in is a compromise between those impulses and the demands which are necessitated by group living.

Dr. KELIHER. Would you modify that to say that you would never willingly submit yourself to dealing with youngsters and adults in such a way that you were using them as means toward nonhuman ends?

Dr. STODDARD. Toward nonhuman ends—I would accept that; but it seems to me that much of the discussion about the impulses of the child—and I am quite in accord with the point that was raised by one speaker with reference to obligations—much of the discussion in the child field has concerned itself with rights, without recognizing the fact that those rights grow out of the relationships between human beings, and that any conception of the relationships of human beings must take into account the fact that there are compromises and adjustments which grow out of that group relationship.

No matter what kind of society you envisage, you have a definite philosophy for training your children. What I would like to see us make clear in our definition of democracy is that philosophy, and it would be an American philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. We cannot define that philosophy this afternoon nor describe it, but do you not think we can raise some of the questions which a democratic philosophy would raise, and thereby get different people's ideas of what a democracy is, because one of our big difficulties lies in the fact that we do not know what democracy is.

Mr. FRANK. Just a concrete illustration of that: Many parents are raising their children with the most conscientious intention of bringing them up to be thrifty, frugal, and law abiding, and to have all the other virtues, yet out of that group we find that a considerable

proportion of children are spolied from the point of view of individual personalities and of society. By "spoiled" I mean that they are either behavior problems, mentally disordered, delinquents, criminals, or sex offenders, or are unable to make a satisfactory adjustment in family life or otherwise.

Does it become our concrete task to ask ourselves whether the methods that are being advocated to parents for bringing up their children, or to the schools, and the practices that are now sanctioned by various groups and philosophies in schools of education, might be tested as to their desirability? I think that makes it very concrete.

There are data on that problem, because delinquents are being studied, sex offenders are being studied, and the people whose marital careers come to an unhappy end are being studied, and those data are illuminating. It would be my suggestion that the conference canvass those data, and meditate and reflect upon them, and interpret them in terms of the underlying practices of child rearing that are expressed in those failures.

HERSCHEL T. MANUEL. I want to bring our discussion back to the only voice of youth so far as I have heard anyone express it. This man back here says that he represents youth. I want to make the very concrete suggestion that this section, in addition to the general problems which are fundamental and universal, make a special effort to assay also the problems of the exceptional child, or the minority groups.

There are in this country a million and a half Spanish-speaking people. We talk about our good-neighbor policy and we have not yet learned how to be good neighbors to the people on this side of the Rio Grande.

AGNES G. REGAN. Perhaps my justification for speaking is that I have taught school for 15 years in some of the schools that may be reprehensible. The title of this section is the development of children and youth in present-day American life, and we have plunged altogether into the youth problem, and we have forgotten that the children we take into the school are practically formed before they come to us. When you get a 6-year-old child in the school his character and his habits of thinking have largely been established. We have to give a great deal of thought to recognition of authority in the home; it is the kind of authority that exists in the home that counts.

We have to emphasize the necessity of parent education as the foundation for the whole development of children; the family is the unit and the basis of society, whether it is a democracy or any other type of organization. We must study home conditions and recognize that there are certain standards and ideals with which we must work and that the children are the result of the standards in the home. One of the leading chiefs of police said to me not long ago, when we talked about the very serious crime condition and I said, "What is your explanation of it?" "Well, my solution of it would be, first of all, more religion in the life of the children, and secondly, exercise of authority in the home and in the school; and thirdly, the building of more homes and fewer boarding houses."

The CHAIRMAN. Are you raising the question that this conference study the types of or the kinds of authoritarian relationships which should be characteristic of democracy?

Miss REGAN. That should be characteristic in a home. I am just emphasizing the importance of the development of children in the home, because the youth is the result of the home.

Mrs. MORROW. Do this conference and the committee in charge of organizing it feel that the youth of America are in such terrible need of improvement, that their democracy is at low ebb? And also, what are we driving at in this conference? Is it a matter of jobs, or is it a matter of character building?

The CHAIRMAN. I am not prepared to answer the first question, but what we are doing this afternoon is to air all of our points of view, so that as many points of view as possible, in terms of problems, can be presented to the committee, for the continuing work of the conference.

RUTH UPDEGRAFF. I do not wish to belittle at all the effect of the home on the child before he is 6 years of age, but after all, at the last White House Conference and a certain time before it we all realized that a great contribution can be made to children of the so-called preschool age. There are many nursery schools developed in the country at the present time, and many other organizations interested in nursery education, which, after all, in my definition, are educational organizations functioning before children are 6 years of age. I should like to make clear that in our discussion of the people in a democracy we ought to take into account the various kinds of educational organizations which can do effective work.

Mrs. WILSON I. COMPTON. It seems to me that we are talking about effects rather than causes. I am not at all worried about my children because I am putting my energies to solving their problems and I think that we are doing that whether we live in the country or in the city. I do not agree with the woman from Montana who thinks that there is a difference; I think there is no difference. The same kind of problem faces children everywhere. The children who are being frustrated today and are facing problems are the parents of tomorrow. Let us study the causes that are back of the failure of the entire family and school and the youth problem. I, in the country, have never felt that wheat or grain will improve of itself or that animals are improved by being allowed to work out their own salvation. It seems to me that we talk about individual problems of children, as if they can be solved alone.

I would like to see this conference go on record as saying that the responsibility of the adult group in a democracy is to give a certain amount of time and money to definite planning and program-making, which certainly cannot be expected of the youth, and it seems to me that if we would take as our responsibility planning for jobs and working toward economic equalization among the people of this country, we would immediately eliminate some of the present conditions.

GEORGE J. HECHT. I must confess that I am somewhat puzzled by the discussion here this afternoon. I thought that we were assembled here in Washington to try to prepare a series of recommendations as

to what we can do about the problems that are facing youth. I did not understand that this was to be a debating society or a child-study group forum. I thought that the objective of this conference was to take an inventory of the conditions that face American children and American youth today, with the hope that the conference would produce some concrete recommendations as to what can be done.

We heard in the President's eloquent address this morning and in other addresses of the many problems of youth; of inadequate houses, of schools that are relatively good in certain big cities, and very poor in rural districts, where the county appropriations are not enough to finance the schools. I thought that this conference could perhaps draw up an inventory of the conditions of American youth that need rectifying, and perhaps along with that an inventory of the social resources of the country to meet the needs of the children.

I do not see that the discussion this afternoon is coming to any concrete recommendations as to things that might be put into effect, that will improve the deplorable conditions of many of the children and youth of America. I would like to see prepared a series of concrete recommendations similar—not the same, of course, but of a similar nature—to those that came out of the first conference. Perhaps if there was a small number of recommendations, there would be more chance of putting them into effect than if there were too large a number.

At the last White House Conference it took 25 volumes to publish the reports of the deliberations, and those 25 volumes were useful because they summed up, as I understand it, what we knew about the conditions affecting children, and the best methods of improving the conditions. There were several volumes on child health, several volumes on education, and altogether it was an inventory of the best knowledge on children.

Doubtless the staff will sum up the new developments since the last conference, but among the recommendations that I would like to see grow out of this conference is this: We know a good deal about children, about progressive education, about the problems of delinquency, about vocational education, about the problems of youth—including one point that has not been mentioned this afternoon, the apprenticeship suggestions, which seem to me very concrete. But the great trouble, it seems to me, is that we are not disseminating the results of research that we already know. I think the emphasis for the past 10 years, or probably 20 years, has very wisely been on research; that is, finding out what needs to be done, and the best methods to solve problems such as I have outlined.

Now we have, fortunately, a great body of information and what we need to do is to disseminate that information. If American parents knew all that the scientists and doctors know about child health, the children of America would be much healthier. The trouble is that the information that comes from our universities and our laboratories is not disseminated to the parents who really need the information.

Let us emphasize the importance, not of finding out new facts, but of spreading widely by means of newspapers, radio, magazines, pamphlets, speeches—every possible way—information that we already have, in order that the parents, the school teachers, and the

community leaders may take that knowledge and apply it to the children.

The CHAIRMAN. That is without question one of the problems which this conference will want to consider, and ultimately to make recommendations on. As I understand it the recommendations are to come later; we are supposed to discuss the problems and some of the causes of the problems in our present-day culture, with regard to growth of children and youth. You have certainly touched one very important point, how to disseminate information.

Mr. HOLLANDER. I think that if we want to be realistic we must recognize the fact that while we are operating in a democracy, that democracy has an economic base, and that economic base is a capitalistic economy. Now, I am all for capitalism; I benefit from it, so please do not imagine that I am urging that the capitalistic system be overthrown. But I do not see how we can be realistic in facing these problems that are involved in democracy unless we recognize the economic relationships.

Let me give one concrete example: We know from the earlier White House Conference that there are certain rights and certain conditions that children are entitled to. Let me be specific and say: health, food, recreation, security in the home, certain fundamentals of that sort. We recognize that, or at least we give lip service to it. But when we try to put them into effect we run up against certain conditions that are brought about by our existing economic system. Look for a moment at the study by the Interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, of which Miss Josephine Roche is chairman. They found, with respect to the 10 diseases which caused deaths in greatest numbers, that there were more than twice as many deaths in families whose incomes were under \$1,000 as in families with incomes over \$1,000.

When we come to one specific condition of that sort and try to trace its ramifications we find that in that enormous area of our population—and for the great majority of our population incomes are less than \$1,000 a year—the death of the breadwinner will mean that all of those things which we call fundamental in child life—food, security, health, education, clothing, recreation—every one of those is affected. It seems to me, therefore, that we cannot very well discuss democracy without also taking into account the economic system on which our democracy is based.

One gentleman here made a very specific and excellent suggestion, from one point of view, that we try to delineate certain areas in which jobs for children should be monopolized, let us say. Certainly youth should have work opportunities. The absence of work opportunities is unquestionably involved in many of the difficulties that we are having in this country at the present time, of which the large percentage of youthful criminals is just one aspect. But you must recognize that you cannot take away that large body of jobs without depriving adults of those jobs. In certain large industrial cities in my State, I have personally seen a tremendous number of young people in the youth group who got jobs while their parents were sitting at home workless, and had been workless for years. Now, if we are interested in the problems of families, as Rabbi Goldstein said we must be—for unquestionably any discussion of child care

is absurd without considering it in relation to the families—what is going to be the effect on the family life in those families, when we see the children made the job-holders and the parents thrown on the scrap heap? It is going to result in all sorts of family demoralization, in which the children will participate. It has been brought out, I think, that the average length of time after young people leave school before they get jobs is now over 3 years in this country. And there is an enormous number of young people who have not had any regular jobs for 6 years from the time they left school. We certainly must see what the effect of that is going to be on children. But we cannot consider making jobs for children alone and disregard the need for making jobs for adults at the same time. The problems of childhood are inextricably interwoven with the problems of family life, and we do not have security in family life at the present time.

I quite agree with the gentleman who spoke last, the essence of whose remarks, as I gather, is that if we did not hold this conference at all, and did not attempt to find one new fact, but simply put into effect or tried to put into effect the facts that we already know, we would be making an enormous contribution to the welfare of children. More facts certainly are desirable, but facts are of no use unless we can put them into effect. When we attempt to put them into effect, we are going to run up at once against the economic system in which we live—how much will it cost? It is impossible to spend those millions and billions of dollars without having a tax rate that is going to break completely the economic capitalistic system in which we live.

I am not saying that it should not be done, I am for it, and I certainly am not advocating the overthrow of the capitalistic system—don't let anybody think that I am talking socialism. I certainly want you to recognize the fact that our democracy is based, or is rooted in, a certain economic system, and that all of the things that we may consider, and all of the things already considered that we would like to put into effect, are going to run head on against the facts of that economic system and it is going to be very difficult to make them effective.

The CHAIRMAN. May we say that you are raising a question of economic planning in a democracy, and perhaps the responsibility of the government and of other agencies for that planning?

Mr. HOLLANDER. I do not think that that can be eliminated if we are going to consider the needs of youth. What we are interested in primarily is how those needs can be met, and you cannot consider meeting those needs unless you take into consideration the economic factors of our present-day life, and the relation of government to our democratic system. And so I think that we should make our recommendations realistic. If we try to side-step the economic factors that are fundamental in all of these things, we will be dooming ourselves to futility.

MARY ALICE JONES. I think there is another factor that we must face if we are going to be realistic. Apparently some of us have been assuming that there is agreement on a good many of these points. It seems to me that it is the very essence of democratic societies that every group is perfectly free to teach its children what it thinks is right.

We can no more tell parents what they must teach their children than we can do some of these other very difficult things that have been pointed out. We can have in democratic society, and we do have, a great many organizations which are not tax-supported which teach things that are contrary to some of the things which tax-supported groups are teaching. That is true of motion pictures, true of the community life as a whole; and there are still other standards of values and points of view being taught.

Let us say we send a group of children out with certain definite points of view regarding a way of life which to us seems good. In the community into which they go they may come into contact with persons who have been taught that another system of values is much better. In a democracy it seems to me it is inevitable that we are going to have that sort of situation.

One of our problems, it seems to me, is to try to help children and young men and young women to know how to live in a situation in which there are these basic differences of opinion and not to feel that we have to teach people exactly how to do things in order to have them done right. In the home and in the various groups that set themselves up as character-building agencies or agencies of religious education, or what have you, we have quite different points of view within our social order being taught by responsible and sincere persons. Our young people and our children are either the victims or the fortunate possessors of these varying points of view, and that it seems to me presents a serious problem for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the constructive understanding and valuation of differences is one of the matters that you think needs to be studied?

Mrs. GRUENBERG. Possibly parent education is responsible in some measure for making home life unattractive as pictured by children. We find in working with young people that they have a very unattractive picture of family life for their own futures, and we as educators are partly responsible for that. Now that parenthood becomes a choice with increasing numbers, there is a responsibility that many are entirely unprepared for in the acceptance of children as personalities.

Children are becoming more and more precious, not only to the individual parent but to the community, because we have fewer of them.

Part of the point that I made earlier is that parents have been trying to run their homes for children. We are talking about democracy, and it is just as autocratic to have a child-centered home as to have a parent-centered home; the moment the center is in one or the other age group autocracy begins.

It seems to me that our job, and the job of this conference, is to try to formulate for American home life some of the substitutes for the good old trite virtues, virtue-producing responsibilities and activities and interrelations of children and adults. There is a very challenging opportunity, and we have much more information about it than the records show, because we have been so engrossed in statistical research that some people who have a great deal of information have not been given an opportunity to record that information because it does not lend itself to statistical forms. I am not belittling these

forms; they have been invaluable. But we can use these other forms of information also. In the interest of the youth of tomorrow and the parents of tomorrow it seems to me that we ought to formulate what are acceptable patterns of family living.

Mrs. F. R. KENISON. Speaking as a parent, I am thinking that perhaps our lack of knowledge of young people might be part of the dilemma.

Many young people graduate from high school and continue in higher education with little or no sense of direction, because they don't know what they are preparing for or what their way of living is to be. Perhaps if they had a little help along that line they would be more successful. They should not be allowed to proceed by the trial and error method.

Dr. KELIHER. Perhaps we should close on that thought. We always ask ourselves why we do anything; what is the objective.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the adult issue that has been emphasized throughout this meeting, and this should probably be the one that we take away with us.

Section 4: The Child and Community Services for Health, Education, and Social Protection

Chairman: Frank Bane, Executive Director, The Council of State Governments

EXCERPTS FROM DISCUSSION

The **CHAIRMAN**. This section is to deal with the child and community services for health, education, and social protection. The first question which has been raised is, "What do we mean by the community, the child, and by community services for health, education, and social protection?" Do we mean the neighborhood, the magisterial district, the ward, the county, the city, the State, the Nation, or do we mean all of them?

It has been suggested that section four should discuss the work of the conference from the point of view of organized community services for health, education, and social protection in relation to the following: (1) The increasing importance of community services to the child as civilization becomes more complex, as responsibility for many functions formerly carried on in the homes must now represent cooperative effort between parents and community agencies; (2) distribution of services over the country, in rural areas, cities, geographic divisions; (3) availability of services to various groups in the population, racial, economic, migratory, and so forth; (4) trends in problems in public and private financing of community services; (5) principles underlying Federal, State, and local responsibility for, and administration of, community services for children; (6) trends in division of child-welfare functions between administrative and judicial agencies; (7) personnel available and training programs, the merit system; (8) problems involved in creating and maintaining an informed public opinion relating to community services.

These major issues may be considered with respect to the following fields:

1. Health. Considered in the light of the National Health Conference, the National Health Survey, and other recent undertakings, what areas and what child-health services need special attention from this country?

2. Education. In the light of recent work of the Educational Policies Commission, the Regents' Survey in New York State, and other undertakings, what aspects of education need special attention from this conference, and how may they best be dealt with?

3. Social protection. What aspects of relief and assistance, foster-home care, institutional care, protective service, organized recreation, and administration of the State-wide and local child-welfare services need special attention and how may the work of the conference be most effective in these fields?

With your permission we will approach these various problems, the over-all general problems, and the specific problems, one at a time, that is, from the standpoint of these various functions of government which have been here outlined. I should like to ask Dr. Helmholtz to comment first on the questions that have been proposed in this outline, particularly with respect to health.

HENRY F. HELMHOLZ. All that I can do at this time is to call attention to one or two important points. The one I want to emphasize first concerns the education of the public in health needs. I think that in going into any community and putting on a health program we must first convince the public that there is need for such a program. We have tried it in our county; we put on a good-health program and then lost that program because we lost sight of the fact that this rural community did not appreciate what was being done for it. When farmers come in and tell us that they have a public-health nurse forced down their throats, it reflects on our program in not having convinced them that that was a necessity for the health of the community.

With regard to the health part of this program, I do not believe it is so much a matter of what shall we do, but of whether we have funds to carry out the work that we know should be done in the obstetric field and in the pediatric field. We have been able to reduce to a minimum infant mortality from diarrheal diseases. At the same time the deaths during birth and in the week following have remained at practically the same level for the past 25 years. There is a cooperative piece of work to be done there between the obstetrician and the pediatrician. I think it is largely a matter of applying those things that we know help in the development of health in the infant and the preschool child to the school child and during the period of adolescence. Recently the pediatrician has interested himself in the adolescent period, because it has been a neglected period just as was formerly the preschool period.

To show how the economic situation has affected health, I need only call your attention to the reappearance of scurvy and rickets in many areas of the United States that had been free from these diseases for many years before 1929. That shows the relationship of economic conditions to the medical situation in the care of the children.

MAYSIL M. WILLIAMS. I may say that in North Dakota our chief need at the present time is our economic need. For a number of years we have suffered, probably more than some of the other States because of our drought, so that our problem is complicated at the present time by this situation. Our nutrition problem has come up in the past few years, I think since 1929. Rickets is probably more prevalent than it was several years ago. I would say that for our State, for the Sagebrush States, as we sometimes call them out there, our economic situation is our big problem at the present time.

A. T. McCORMACK. We have never been bothered, as has the rest of the country, by the economic situation; our situation has always been uneconomic in the sense in which professors talk about things

of that sort, and we have always had to substitute brains for means. I am still a little shocked at being reorganized, but that reorganization throws us into closer relationship with those who have to do with education and with social security, which, while a comparatively recent development in thought, is, after all, the basis of all we do. As soon as the State of Missouri began to pay pensions to the blind they began to develop in their health departments methods for the prevention of blindness, because they were constantly increasing a wholly unnecessary expense. As rapidly as we begin to care for crippled children, which costs a great deal more each year than caring for normal children, we shall be interested in preventing the crippling of children. I think the alliance between the health of the people, the education of the people, and the security group will be of mutual advantage to all of us, because it will enable us to be perfectly frank and to criticize one another in terms of the backgrounds from which we have come, and that will be constructive for the whole group.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we jump, for just a moment, for a bird's-eye view, to the field of education, and hear from Dr. Carr of the National Education Association on the points which have been raised.

WILLIAM G. CARR. I have jotted down four things about American education that I think this conference or any other conference concerned with the welfare of children ought to consider. The first thing is the very simple fact that for large numbers of American children the idea of a substantial minimum of educational opportunity is totally in the realm of the ideal. That is true with respect to differences between the races. It is equally true with respect to the differences between rural and urban children and with respect to the children in different parts of the country. There are large numbers of children in the United States who are not receiving education of any kind, and there are even larger numbers who are not receiving the kind of education which this group or any other disinterested fair-minded group would say is a minimum of educational opportunity necessary for boys and girls who are going to be citizens in a democracy. That is a bold statement, and I will not try to support it except to say that the evidence has been fully compiled by the Advisory Committee on Education appointed by the President; it has been included in its report. The committee agreed unanimously that certain types of action should be taken in the matter, and the report has been transmitted to Congress.

The second thing that I think this conference or any other conference that is really concerned with the welfare, education, and health of children will have to be concerned about may be stated this way: There will have to be worked out and perfected in this country such arrangements for the administration of the educational program as will make it absolutely sure that that program cannot be invaded by any special-interest group, cannot be distorted into the purposes of regimentation as we have seen happen in other countries. While predominant and complete responsibility to the will of the whole people is preserved, the system must be left free for effective cooperation with the other social services. We must see to it that there are neither overlapping services nor overlooked needs in this field of education. I think this problem, therefore, of

the administrative relationships of education is one to which this conference will have to give attention. There again I am not attempting to prejudice the situation; I am merely stating a problem which I think is important.

The third problem to which this conference will have to give attention, I think, relates to the situation of large numbers of youth in this country who have the choice of unemployment or school or some kind of relief activity. To the educational people and to those who work with education that situation presents a challenge for the invention—I think invention is not too strong a term—of a type of educational program which will meet the needs of these young people who have been put into our secondary schools and many of those who should be in our secondary schools.

Those needs exist and can be met by education; but they cannot be met by just any kind of education, nor by an education which is centered wholly on books. One of the problems that this conference will have to face is the problem of developing a program of education for America in the secondary schools, a program which will suit the needs of all children, just as the elementary-school program haltingly, but still in a way, serves the need of all children in the elementary school.

We should look forward to the time when we have a common school extending from the kindergarten at least through the tenth or twelfth grade to which all children will go. In that common school a new type of program will have to be developed—a type of program which will give not merely identity of educational programs to every child, but real equality of opportunity, which means the adjustment of the program to the interests, the needs, and the abilities of the child; the provision of special programs for those with special handicaps of one kind or another, mental or physical; the provision of enriched programs for those who are especially endowed.

And finally, the fourth thing that I think this conference will have to be concerned with—and it is a matter which is already attracting the attention of educators very aggressively—is the radical, prompt improvement of our programs of education for civic responsibility.

The schools have not been idle in that field. It has not been a matter which has escaped their attention, but situations outside the school, in our own land and elsewhere, have pointed up with new vigor and urgency the need for some sort of program for the development of loyalty to democratic ideals, a loyalty which will be not merely of the flag-saluting kind, but a loyalty which is intelligently based on a clear understanding of the meaning of democracy—what it will mean to us if we lose it, what values it has and how it came about—a loyalty, furthermore, which is not only intelligent and enthusiastic, but which is active; that is, a loyalty which is willing to make the ideals function in the everyday lives of people, not just in their political lives.

Those four problems are some of the things which, offhand, I think ought to have the consideration of this conference.

The CHAIRMAN. What can a conference of this kind do to promote various objectives as outlined by Dr. Carr? What can a conference of this kind do to improve the general educational situation in the country? We happen to have in the audience Dr. Floyd Reeves,

who is chairman of the President's committee that worked on this educational survey, and I should like Dr. Reeves to comment briefly on those two questions.

FLOYD W. REEVES. It seems that we have available in the field of education a wealth of information that goes beyond anything we have ever had before. It can give us a picture of the situation as it exists in all parts of our commonwealth. We have the facts. We know what the educational picture is; we know what the obstacles are that are standing in the way of a sound program of education.

An earlier speaker commented on several major reports that had been made during the past 2 or 3 years, reports with recommendation for action. It seems to me that the time has arrived when some group should bring together the materials that have been gathered in the field of education and likewise similar materials from the other fields equally important. Bring them together, look at the picture as a whole, deal with the relationships that exist between the several social services, examine the picture as it operates at the Federal, State, and local levels, giving some consideration to the machinery of government and the agencies of government that operate these programs, and giving great attention to the relationships among these agencies and the means that are available or may be made available for coordinating the work of these agencies. Let us be clear on this point: By coordination I do not necessarily mean consolidation. It may be consolidation in some cases; it may not be consolidation in others, but in every case we do need the machinery for coordination of the several social services.

This is a group set up in an ideal manner, it seems to me, to attack that problem and to look at the entire situation with reference to children in a democracy; to utilize the results of these expensive studies that have been made in the several fields and to propose a program of action.

The CHAIRMAN. Very active in this general field for a number of years, and particularly active in recent years, in one of the largest coordinated groups of educators perhaps in the country, has been Dr. Zook, and I should like to have him comment on the questions which Dr. Carr has raised.

GEORGE F. ZOOK. It seems clear enough, of course, that these several social services which have been alluded to here this afternoon have common interests. We who are engaged in the field of education are tremendously anxious to recognize the fact that children have other needs than educational needs, and we are, therefore, very anxious to do everything we can to cooperate with those agencies of government, Federal, State, and local, which are charged with these other responsibilities. We are, however, extremely anxious to be allowed to do our job as best we can, and I should like to be a bit specific about that, because in some of these more recent years we have not been given all the opportunity that we should like to have.

I refer, for example, to the situation when it becomes necessary for the school to feed a child before it gives him any opportunity at an education; when it becomes necessary for the school organization to supply him with shoes before he may be given an opportunity to learn something in the classroom. Before we spend our funds in many other directions, we want an opportunity to do our own job. That

came home to us in the recent depression with very great force indeed, because there were many instances where, because of the urgent necessity of spending funds in some of these other directions, we were prevented from doing the very best job possible.

I want to go on record with respect to one other thing. It has been my privilege during recent years to be connected with some of the national advisory committees having to do with education. I recall very well the fact that in the commission appointed by President Hoover there was a unanimous feeling that something in the way of Federal aid to education was necessary if we were to correct some of the evils which even then were very apparent, but none of us knew any too well what amounts of money might be necessary and in what directions they were to be expended.

In the more recent experience of the Advisory Committee appointed by President Roosevelt we have had the opportunity to secure a great deal of information so that there is no longer any need for one to call for information and research in this area. The President's Advisory Committee came to the unanimous conclusion that something in the way of Federal aid to education is an absolute necessity. That matter has now been presented to Congress; it is before the jury, in some respects, and I hope that the jury will not stay out too long.

We have long needed something of this kind to remove the present inequalities that are before us. I do not have much doubt in my own mind that there may be needs in other areas that are something like as pressing as they are in the field of education, and I should be among the first to recognize those needs. I say, again, that we are desirous of doing our job as well as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Dr. Bousfield in the audience?

M. O. BOUSFIELD. We talk a great deal about health education and about the need to approach the communities on these things, and I defy anybody to show where any more confusion really lies than in the field of health education itself. We have a great many resources at our disposal; we just simply do not organize them for a real attack on any kind of problem.

One other thing that interests me a great deal in these health approaches has to do with the loss of Negro children and mothers, particularly because of bad care and poor midwifery. Something needs to be done toward the training of public-health nurses in midwifery programs, which it seems to me would be a great contribution in this field. Anywhere from 50 to 90 percent of deliveries among Negro mothers in this country are made by midwives, which is an appalling situation.

The CHAIRMAN. We started off with the idea of getting a bird's-eye-view of these three community functions, with the idea, or at least with the hope, that these bird's-eye-views would stimulate you, and would lead to considerable general discussion from the floor as we go along.

I was very much interested in the topic of this meeting, community services for children. Sixteen years ago I had a problem down in Knoxville, Tenn., with respect to community services for children. I had no idea what to do with it, and in that dilemma I got in touch with a gentleman who was then in New York, and asked him to

come down and work with us on the problem of community services for children. Dr. Carstens.

C. C. CARSTENS. One of the things that troubles me in connection with this whole subject of community work for children is that so few of the citizens have the idea that there is any fundamental need for it. It seems to me that we need to have some definition that will help us to convince the general citizen of the various cities and States that there is need for a social program for children, that it isn't merely a nice thing to do.

I have been told that in one of the States, during the past few months, on the floor of the legislature the social workers were referred to as social parasites, and there wasn't on the floor of that house a single person who took up the challenge and was in any way ready to defend them from any such imputation. We have to explain to our citizens that in this complicated life we have something that is needed in the community. I am troubled also by the facts that have come out during the past few months that in this economic reaction the children's bureaus of our various States, perhaps together with other bureaus in departments of social welfare, have suffered from the idea that social service is just something that would be a nice thing to do when you have some money for it, but that it isn't a necessity. Just run over the group of children's bureaus in the various States and see what is happening to them. I prefer not to name the tragedies, but we have had tragedy after tragedy. Something needs to be done, to interpret to our various States that the children's bureaus, whatever they may be called, have a function to perform.

How many of our municipalities are taking services to children seriously and are providing enough recreational opportunities, enough actual protection for the children? I think the number of cities that are doing that is very small. The first administrative spot is in our municipalities, if the children are going to get a square deal.

I am also troubled about our juvenile courts. There are fine judges; we have a few good juvenile courts. We are not getting from the juvenile court what we expected of it back in the early days.

Another problem connected with the court is our training schools. Again we have some fine training schools, but as a whole they represent a weak spot in our State government, in our State administration. I think it is about time that we give additional attention to the subject of delinquency. The Federal Children's Bureau is valiantly at work on this program, and I have no doubt will throw much light on it, but we need other studies, so that this blot on the escutcheon of the United States of delinquency and crime may not have a record of going up but of going down, and that we may become a more definitely law-abiding community and nation.

I am troubled also because our State governments have not yet got to the point where they recognize that expenditures of money for a preventive program—for experiment in that direction, at any rate, if we do not know what a preventive program is—need to be made from year to year. When I studied in a small way some years ago the State budget of Massachusetts, I found that the additional money that was expended from year to year was still in large measure for nothing more than for salvaging the results of break-down of human

life. There was something more for education, there was something more for health, but as far as the social conditions were concerned they were still urged merely to provide for the results of break-down instead of something for prevention or at least experimental work for prevention.

Finally, I am led to believe that most citizens think they know just as much about child welfare as the rest of us. Everybody has some idea at any rate that he knows what ought to be done for a troublesome problem or for the care of a child. So long as that is the case, we find it doubly necessary to get a larger participation on the part of our citizens in this whole problem of social work for children, so that they may here and there, from taking some part in the work, get ideas both as to the complexity of the problem and as to some of the fundamentals of treatment. Social workers are particularly prone to think that professional service is all that is needed. That may be all that is needed in certain fields, but it certainly is not all that is needed in the field of social protection for children. A larger participation by citizens is the only real remedy, in my judgment, for lack of knowledge of what needs to be done. Out of that would come certain opportunities for interpretation that we do not now have, or if we have them we do not make very good use of them.

The CHAIRMAN. I was very much interested in what Dr. Carstens said about the opinion which seems to be prevalent in legislative halls with respect to social workers. In the past 2 years I have heard practically that same statement made in 15 or 20 legislatures, and it has caused me no little concern. At first it caused me much more concern than it does now, because as I thought about it and talked with many of my friends in this field I came to the conclusion that much of the talk was for the record or home consumption, and I saw many signs, in practice, of increasing support of social-work objectives. Dr. Carstens has mentioned the juvenile court. There are several distinguished representatives of the juvenile-court system here in the audience. Judge Kelley has some comments to make.

CAMILLE KELLEY. I think part of the delinquency of young children could be offset if we would realize that patriotism for country is an adventurous and interesting process of thought. I do not think we inculcate enough patriotism into the hearts of the young.

I believe that we should learn to drive the vision of social service into government, into politics, and the power of politics and government into social service.

I will go from that to the other point. I will say, blend your politics and social service. Our President and Mrs. Roosevelt today, in the very heart of the Government, calling a meeting like this, proved to us that it is time that we recognized throughout the United States that it is a privilege to be patriotic.

The thing that handicaps all of us is appropriations. The last thing I will say is that if you had the most wonderful chandelier, that dripped with crystal, and you cut the power off, it would not burn; and if you have the most social program in the world, and you cut it off at the tax source, it will not run.

The CHAIRMAN. It was repeatedly said this morning that since the first White House Conference in 1909 considerable advances have been made in health, education, and welfare services all along the

line. It was also stated that there were all along the line gaps, or a gap here and there, in all of these various services.

This conference is primarily devoted to locating these gaps and determining what we can do about them. We have had four or five short talks dealing with health, education, public welfare, juvenile courts, by way of priming this group, and now we hope very much that you will discuss this general question, "What is the situation in America with respect to child health, with respect to education, with respect to welfare services for children?" First, what is the situation with respect to the scope of these services? Second, what is the content of these services? We have education, we have health, we have welfare services, but are they adequate from the standpoint of content for children in our various communities?

What are the problems of organizations that are centering in Washington today? And what are the problems of organizations in States, in local communities, as well as the Federal Government? Time and again in brief discussions here the question of finances has been touched upon. What is the problem with respect to finances in all these fields? And, finally, what are our administrative problems in these fields which, if we deal with them in any detail at all, touch upon that all-important problem of personality? So it seems to me that we might this afternoon consider health, education, and welfare services in communities for children from the standpoint of the scope and content of these services, organization problems, problems of finances and administration. And along that broad front, what should we work out in this conference, looking toward filling those gaps that we talked about this morning, and making the advances along the whole front much more effective during the next 10 years than they have been during the past decade or even before that? We would like as much argument and discussion and controversy as possible on any or all of these subjects, namely, health, education, and welfare services.

JESSIE F. BINFORD. Whatever gaps there are all over the country, and there are a great many, we all face the great question of relief and of inadequate incomes among people who are not on relief. Our health programs won't work because the children do not have food. We all know that in our communities our educational programs are breaking down, as I think every school teacher will tell us, because children do not have enough food and do not have clothes to go to school. As for social protection for children, it is the same thing there.

I am wondering whether, at a time of terrific emergency such as this whole country faces today—which I suppose every State that we come from faces—when we are piling up health and educational problems faster than we can deal with them for the next 10 or 20 years, it is possible for a conference like this to do something immediately for the children of this country? Many of our private agencies are suffering for lack of support. It is hard to get money. The relief organizations cannot do intensive case work and it perhaps wouldn't do much good if they could. Is there anything we can do at the present time to meet the situation in relation to our children?

RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY. I do not think it is a question now of going ahead. I think it is a question of retaining what we

have, and we are fighting very hard to retain it. What are we discussing right here and now? We said we must get relief from the States. I think that that takes us back 50 years.

The best public benefit I found in Georgia, North Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, Colorado, and California, was that granted by the Works Progress Administration. In Georgia a man gets 20 cents an hour. He never heard of 20 cents an hour before in his life. He got 5 cents an hour and sometimes he did not know what he was going to get on Saturday night, and the boss sent him a sack of meal. The Federal Government has set a standard, and hence it is now the center of attack. Everywhere it is the center of attack because it has lifted and put a cushion under the wage system in many States. At least the worker now asks, "How much do you pay?" He never asked before how much the employer was going to pay. That is improvement for those of us who believe in social reform, in social justice.

You say it hasn't done everything. Of course it hasn't done everything. What reform has covered everything? I hear my friends pointing out the things that haven't been done. We have made one step in advance. We have set up the standard. We have established a work system; it is under discussion now. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations is going to decide, in the next few months, what is going to happen to it.

What about the schools? What is the use of building schools if you do not have roads to get to them? I have seen counties in Georgia that formerly did not have a single mile of hard-surface road, or of roads you could get over in the depths of winter. Now you have roads, due to this program, and you have schools, and you have recreational centers. You should see the recreational centers they have in those counties. Why not put emphasis on the progressive steps that have been taken, because we are now in a period of reaction.

HOWARD S. BRAUCHER. I want to speak about some of the gaps in the recreation field because the Chairman has spoken of gaps. In a little study we made we found that in the regular work there are now 30,000 persons employed, mostly under government tax funds. If all the cities and towns had a provision equal to that of Milwaukee or Los Angeles or other leading cities, we would need 150,000 more workers. That is, five times the present number of recreation workers would be added simply to give a standard that is generally accepted. That shows a little of the need in a single field of regular work, not counting the emergency work that is being carried on at the present time.

I want to say a word about the failure to use facilities that are right at our door. I have on my desk a clipping from Providence, R. I. Two boys were arrested and tried because they attempted to break into a school to play basketball, and that in a place where the superintendent of schools is very much interested in doing things. A recreation leader was taking me about in a large city in the Middle West, and on a Sunday he showed me a school yard with iron pickets and 200 youngsters who had climbed the fence to get in and would have to climb the fence to get out. It was not the fault of the superintendent of schools. He had not been provided with the necessary money.

In a meeting of superintendents of schools last October, the plea was made that the National Recreation Association should work on developing public sentiment to provide the money for the adequate use of the school facilities that we have. The fault I think is not the fault of the school superintendents. It goes back to the questions we have been talking about this afternoon. We must have a public sentiment that is local, that will be articulate when the question of appropriations come up. We have today in the United States practically 6 billion dollars of investment in facilities that might be used, but we haven't begun yet to have the use of what is available.

There has been a constant growth. The curve is upward, except for the unusual depression period. At the present moment the difficulty is with local tax loads. Some cities have voted recently in favor of establishing recreation centers by tax support, but by only a very narrow margin. In general, the people feel that their tax burden is too heavy.

The CHAIRMAN. Two questions have been raised. Miss Binford is concerned about the fact that we have issues and problems we ought to do something about now. Father O'Grady mentions, however, that our big problem at the present time is not so much an extension, but the preservation of what we already have in a time of general reaction against these services.

DORA H. STOCKMAN. I am in hopes that this group will go out in the next year and summarize all the fine things that we have been doing for the children. I am hoping that this conference will show legislators the fine things we have done. I don't want to whitewash the things we haven't done by any means. I also want to rise in defense of the legislators. The State of Michigan this year is trying to find out how it can pay for education. It has just passed a 2 billion dollar emergency fund, and is trying to put 40 million dollars back for State aid in rural areas. And I want to say in defense of the legislators that they want to be shown what they get for their money. The common everyday folks living on the farms and in the cities are not aware of what we really need. We might think a little bit about it in this survey, and if we want to make it go over in a big way, let us find out what the folks really are doing and want to do, as well as what we have not done.

H. L. DONOVAN. Dr. Carr mentioned the bill now before the Congress that will tend to equalize educational opportunities. We are talking about what this conference can do. If this conference will get behind that bill, it will do more for the children than anything else. I come from the South, where we have one-third of the Nation's children with only one-sixth of the Nation's wealth with which to educate them. I was deeply impressed this morning with what Mrs. Roosevelt had to say with respect to where people go during their lifetime. Three and one-half million southern boys and girls are now to be found in the northern States. Their education is a national problem. It is no longer a local problem, and we must find money wherever money is to educate children wherever they are.

In my own State we have very largely a local school system. It is true the State contributes something towards the education of the children, but a child in one county has fifteen times as much wealth

behind him as children in other counties, and so long as we have that condition existing, we are going to have literally tens of thousands—yes, millions—of children that do not have equal educational opportunity, no matter what the total education bill of the Nation happens to be.

If we had as good schools in this Nation as we would all like to have, we would still have millions of children unable to take advantage of those schools because of lack of income. Nothing has been said today about the work of the National Youth Administration. It is my judgment that no money has been spent by the Federal Government that has brought a better social return or obtained a better dividend than the money spent by the National Youth Administration. In the first place there has been no big overhead because it has been administered by agencies already in existence. It is my own candid opinion that the National Youth Administration ought to have a great deal more money than it now has in order that thousands of children who are still not able to attend school might have that opportunity.

I do not know whether you have ever thought of it, but we have for the first time approached a period in the history of our country when children are competing for funds with the aged. There is just a certain amount of money that any nation can spend out of its national income for health, education, and social welfare, and now for the first time children are competing with the aged. I think that we, who represent the children, ought to see that they get a square deal with respect to public funds. I have sometimes thought it might be necessary to franchise the children down to the age of 10 in order that they may offset these people who are going to vote for old-age pensions at any price. I believe that three things should be done by this conference: (1) It should strongly support the bill for appropriations from the National Government for education; (2) we should ask for more appropriation for the National Youth Administration; and (3) we should see that children have a square deal in getting their just part of the national income for health, education, and physical welfare.

JAMES E. WEST. I have listened with a great deal of interest and some concern to discussions here this afternoon. As I understand it, we are one of four sections that are meeting for the purpose of developing problems, areas of opportunity for further development, responsive to the splendid program that was outlined this morning. I say "program," for there is in the course of development a program of action that will require a full year of study, expert treatment, and recommendations. We were told this morning that as a result of that study a report would be presented, and before that report was presented, a copy would be made available to each of us in order that we may make our own comment. This particular group is concerned with the consideration of the child and the community services for health, education, and social protection. What can we say to the management of those responsible for the development of the report with reference to these three major divisions, based upon our experience, setting forth an opportunity for further service?

I think it is splendid that there is, as has been said here today, evidence of so much progress. It is splendid that there is evidence

of concern as to what we are going to do now. But I think it highly important that if we are to make any substantial advance we must make sure that it is done on the basis of facts that will command action and public support, and will secure attention to, and improvement of, community service for health, education, and social protection.

America has done a very good job, as has been said, and certainly until recent years no country in the world had a better record of accomplishment in the field of education for its youth. But in recent years, whether we like it or not, first, Russia, then Germany, and then Italy has said to the world that it has arrived at a place where there is a new appreciation of the importance of sound education of youth. I said "sound": sound from their point of view, for what they have in mind. Bear in mind that all of these countries, no matter how they may differ in their politics and in their ambitions, recognize that every child is entitled to the best opportunity for education in health, and health to them comes first. They are not attempting to do so much to stimulate mental alertness as we do in America, but they are attempting to develop individuals who will support their particular form of government.

We here in America cannot do things that way. We are a democracy and we are challenged to bring to the youth of America the same advantages as those enjoyed in other countries, through democratic procedures, and how can we hope to do it except as we educate the people of America?

It is a problem of bringing organizers, communities, and neighborhoods to understand and become vitally interested in their own children, in an intelligent way, and not merely on a basis of sentiment alone. Every family in America would stand up and proclaim that the most precious, the most valuable assets that it has are its children. Nevertheless, although we do not yet have the reports giving half of the picture as it might be painted, we know that not only is what has been said here about education and recreation true, but in other fields also the gap between what ought to be done and what is being done is enormous.

We must be aroused so that the rank and file of the American people are brought out of a feeling of complacency about these things and are willing to do something about it—are willing to pay for it, and preferably pay for it locally. We cannot expect the Federal Government to do all that has to be done to give youth a fair deal here in America. The gentleman who spoke about the problems of education presented a very practical outline. In my judgment, one fundamental factor should be added. I believe thoroughly in teaching youth to know about government and developing an attitude of mind which makes them desire to do something about government.

In scouting, we teach participating citizenship, but the schools of America have something more to do. The people of America have to realize more clearly that unfortunately our agencies and our efforts in the home and in the church are inadequate to give the children of America that kind of education and those types of experience which develop their characters and make them law-abiding, self-respecting, participating citizens to the extent that we are entitled to expect in a democracy such as ours. We in scouting

find that it is practical to enlist people to do for their own children. The thing that has given the Boy Scouts its strength today is not the small group of 1,200 professional workers. They are essential but the rank and file and the backbone of scouting are the groups of 281,000 men who have been recruited and who, at their own expense, attend training courses and qualify to do jobs to help to make boys understand, who take advantage of the opportunities for the kind of training and education which develops character and trains for citizenship.

I had a great deal to do with the first White House conference, and one of the main outcomes of that conference was the establishment of the Federal Children's Bureau. The Children's Bureau has been a godsend to the youth of America, but it has been almost the orphan child of this great Federal Government. It has had inadequate support and today it has inadequate support in proportion to the things that need to be done. I hope that the record will show, reviewing what has taken place today, a very earnest recommendation for adequate financial support for the Children's Bureau in order that it may have the staff to deal with these problems that all of us are aware of so that we may have facts as a basis for our program making and our organization procedures.

JAMES HOGE RICKS. I wish to mention one of the gaps which our Chairman referred to a moment ago, and that is provision for the class of children generally known as the "mental defective." In the juvenile court we are constantly faced with the problem of what to do with the defective child. As I understand this conference, we are supposed to face the problem of every child. We cannot overlook the fact that mentally defective children are filling our institutions; they are filling our almshouses, where almshouses still exist as in Virginia; they are filling our jails and penitentiaries; and they are marching in a steady line through our juvenile courts.

I want to say to you educational people that your program does not touch this problem. I see the reports that come from schools. Here is a child who was in the first grade for 3 years, and then they advanced him to the second grade, not because the second grade had anything for him, but because the first grade was tired of bothering with him. After attending school a year or two longer, he advances to the third and possibly to the fourth grade, and then he drops out of school. He is on the street. Industry has no place for him. No vocational training has yet been devised which trains this boy or this girl for his or her place in the community. I believe that this is one of the big gaps in our child-welfare program, and I trust that this conference will recognize that gap and will make a place in its report for a substantial plan for the care of the feeble-minded child.

I saw a list of topics the other day for a conference which is to be held this summer, and this problem was included. It was prepared, by the way, by juvenile-court judges. "How shall we obtain more adequate institutional care for the feeble-minded child?" I wrote back to the secretary saying "Shouldn't we make that, 'How may we obtain more adequate care?'" Leave out the word, "institutional." Many of these children do not belong in institutions. I believe that they can and should be provided for in our own local communities, and I hope that a program may be developed which will enable us

to know just what we can do to fit these hewers of wood and drawers of water into a real place in the community life, where they can serve and live happy and satisfied lives.

JOSEPH W. MOUNTIN. I wish to speak on one of the topics suggested to us for discussion this afternoon, and that is health, and more specifically on the defects in our health programs, the gaps that must be filled in. There are a number of them, and I shall not go over the field, but shall use the few moments allotted in discussing what, in the minds of the technical committee on medical care and the interdepartmental committee, is the most glaring defect at the present moment, and that is medical care. In the past our programs for health—that is, publicly supported programs—have in the main been directed toward correction of the environmental factors that contribute to morbidity and mortality. We have also attempted to approach the problem by education of the public as to the nature of disabilities, the causes of illness, and have recommended that something be done about it. That is about as far as we have gone.

As to the elimination of the diseases that are due to environmental factors, we have made tremendous progress. I think the public also has a pretty fair knowledge of what is needed, or what needs to be done to attain health. But when it comes to doing something in the field that demands medical attention, they face the problem of being unable to pay for it. Under the present economic dispensation, medical care is obtainable in direct proportion to the ability to pay. It is a private commodity. In spite of all that may be said to the contrary, every substantial survey that has been made has shown that there is excessive illness among the underprivileged group, among the lower-income groups. As the income level goes down, illness rates go up. And those same surveys invariably show that the amount of care that is received is determined by the person's ability to pay for it. In the judgment of the technical committee and the interdepartmental committee, that is the obvious and the most pressing problem today in the field of general health, and particularly in child health.

With reference to infant mortality, mention has been made of the fact that during the first few days and the first few weeks of life, there is an excess of illness and an excess of mortality against which we have made very little or no progress. That is essentially a problem of medical care. The same is true of maternal mortality. Mention was made by a previous speaker of some 50 or 60 or 70 percent of the women in certain areas being delivered by midwives. I have in mind a county where the same statement has been made, but as we examine the situation and the quality of the so-called midwives, they are not midwives at all. They are merely neighborhood women who agree to stand by when one of the citizens of the community is in childbirth. By no stretch of the imagination can they be classed as midwives. That, as I have said, is a pressing problem in the area of maternal and child health, and it seems to me the question before the house, so to speak, is "What are you going to do about it?"

It is the opinion of the technical committee and of the interdepartmental committee that some measure of public intervention is necessary, and an increase in the organized facilities is essential.

There has been considerable talk about opposition. Actually, that opposition will fade away as soon as the American people declare in unmistakable terms that they wish to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we adjourn, I want to call on a gentleman who has participated in the development of these programs about which we have talked, marking a great advance in our American life. His share has perhaps been as great as that of any man in this country, and he has probably as accurate an over-all view of the community with respect to health, education, and welfare as any person I know: Dr. Frank Graham.

FRANK P. GRAHAM. I wish to speak in behalf of all the parts of the program that have been so ably spoken for here today, the Children's Bureau, the work of the Technical Interdepartmental Committee, the juvenile courts, and the whole broad range. However, if I may exercise a little authority at this point, I would like to answer a question raised here by one of the speakers. It was suggested that the Federal Government should not be asked to carry the whole load of public education. May I interpolate to say that there is no measure now before the American people which carries in its provisions more of the substance of the theme of this conference than the Thomas-Harrison-Larrabee bill now before Congress, providing for Federal aid to the States for public education. Contained in the provisions of that bill are references to two of the greatest things in this country, children and democracy. That bill does not ask the Federal Government to carry the whole load of public education; it merely proposes to supplement the two billion dollars now provided by the States and localities with \$40,000,000 for the public schools. It is mainly a bill for rural children. The rural people of the United States receive only 9 percent of the national income and yet educate 31 percent of the Nation's children. There are three States in this Union that have great difficulty in providing as much as \$30 annually per child. There are three other States in this Union that almost easily, comparatively speaking, provide more than \$130 per child.

We do not have a democracy in America when we invest \$220 in one child's education and less than \$20 in another child's. You can say, "We will leave that to the States." Let me take just one State—not by name—by way of illustration. If this State took all its general funds, and gave nothing to public health and nothing to anything else under the sun except the public schools, the children in that State would even then not receive the average now expended on the children of the whole country. So if you say, "Leave it to the States," you simply say, "We don't believe in equality of educational opportunities for the children in this country."

An educational lag in any part of the country is an economic, cultural, social damage to all parts of the country. That is not just a generalization. Forty percent of the young people who were on the farms in 1920 were in the great industrial or urban areas in 1930, and 60 percent of that net migration was from the southern rural areas. May I state it this way: That part of this country which has less than one-third of the population has more than half of the excess of births over deaths. These are some hard facts that search right through the nature of American democracy.

What is the American way? The Philadelphia Convention in 1787 illustrates for us the American way. The struggle was on between the big States and the little States. The big States said, "This Nation shall be based on people." The little States said, "This Nation shall be based on States." Little Delaware stood up, speaking for the little States, and said, "If you big States put this over on us and base this Nation on people, we will get out and confederate. We will stay in France instead of with Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Massachusetts." And George Washington, presiding over that convention, appointed a committee which brought in the American way and based this Nation both on States and on people. That is the American way, and this education bill is a fulfillment of the American way. This bill, providing Federal aid to States for schools, is carrying forward a great American tradition. We have Federal aid for everything else under the sun, but we have not yet provided Federal aid for the most American of all our institutions. With democracy in retreat in many parts of the world, the United States of America issues a new declaration for more equal opportunity for all the children in all the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has come when we really must adjourn. We would like to hear from all of those who are now standing and want to be heard, and I am very happy, even if I cannot recognize you, to see you standing, because it indicates a great and continuing interest in what we have been discussing.

DINNER SESSION

Presiding: The Chairman of the Conference, Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to ask you to come to order and to discuss for a while some of the matters in which we have been interested during this day of session and particularly to discuss out loud some of the things which we all have been discussing privately in the times between meetings.

It has been a very interesting meeting, not only in the subjects that have been discussed but in the personal relationships which have been established and in the sense of faith and good will one with another, not only among those who are here in Washington today, but also among those whom we represent throughout the country. That sense of good will among the people who are trying to do the right thing for the children of this country is one of the most beautiful and comforting sidelights of a great conference such as this, because this is the kind of friendship that does not rest on what we used to call personal loyalty, but rests upon that deeper and more consequential thing, loyalty to the cause itself. That is why we never doubt each other and are never afraid to trust each other or to ask help in some good enterprise when we know that we can prove that it is both practical and in harmony with the programs to which we have long been devoted.

We have here tonight a telegram from a woman who regrets exceedingly that she is not here:

Regret that I am not able to attend the first meeting of the Fourth Conference on Child Welfare which is one of great importance. Democracy is a general term, and its definition in the rights and needs of children will be difficult. Apart from the title of the conference, it is imperative that we review again the problems that still need to be met in the improvement of life for children. The calling in of private as well as public agencies should make for the creation of leadership which can contribute much at this time. I hope I shall be of some use on the committees and in the final conference.

GRACE ABBOTT.

And we have here, too, another telegram on behalf of an old friend of most of us, from a close friend of Lillian Wald, now staying with her in Connecticut. She wishes you to know that in her present condition Miss Wald is not able to send any greetings. As soon as her condition makes it possible, she will be told about your fine tribute to her yesterday and will, I know, wish to send her love and blessing to this conference. I hope that all of us will hold this great friend in blessed thought and recollection and prayer for her peace and welfare during all these days.

We have here a good many people who have honored us by coming to this dinner, although some have not been able to be with us dur-

ing all the proceedings of the conference. The Surgeon General, Dr. Parran, is here, and I know that you are all happy to see him.

We also have with us the Honorable George Bigge of the Social Security Board. Ten years ago I attended the opening meeting of the White House Conference on Children, and nobody so much as murmured, "Social Security." A few of us, in talking about the problems of employment for children, had a little to say about the necessity of providing some kind of insurance or allowance for persons who were unemployed through no fault of their own, and there may have been a few who muttered something about how the care of the aged burdened the lives of young people, but we did not discuss it.

It is a great satisfaction to realize that we have a full-fledged, going concern in our social-security law in this country and that we are now discussing revisions and broadening the base. I think on the whole we can have great satisfaction in feeling that underlying some of the things we have been trying to do for the welfare of children, there is a foundation in the social-security program, holding up welfare, income, and opportunity for living of the families of our country.

We have another distinguished visitor whom I want to introduce tonight, Secretary Wallace. What he has just had to say to me about a brief survey of conditions in rural families interested me so much that I hope he will share it briefly with you people here tonight.

Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture

About 6 o'clock this evening there was brought in to me a report from the Farm Security Administration which I looked over rather hastily and I thought Madam Secretary might be interested in it. It is a report from two counties in the South.

Fifty families there were engaged in noncommercial agriculture, as are a great many families in the South. In one county, 70 of the children in the families studied had rickets; in the other county, 60 of the children. In one county there was no pellagra and in the other there were 14 cases. In one county, no hookworm; and in the other some 20 cases of hookworm.

There were various other types of difficulties quite as appalling that had no concern with the children. Those of the individuals in these families who were above 16 years of age had in one county an I. Q. of 8 years and in the other county an I. Q. of 10 years. Both counties present a very difficult situation indeed.

I would relate this to observations drawn from a study by the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, published by the General Education Board. It had to do with the illegitimate children of some 147 mothers. Most of you are no doubt familiar with this study. The I. Q. of well over half these mothers was known; it averaged 87. The fathers had gone through sophomore year in high school, on the

average. As babies these children were placed in various families—we may say average or perhaps a little above average families—and at an age of about 3 or 4 years, they had an average I. Q. of 116—equal to that of the children of university professors. There were 16 children of mothers who were feeble-minded, with an average I. Q. of 66. Those children had an average I. Q. of 108. Not one was feeble-minded.

The point I want to make is this, and it is a favorite point with me. On the average, the children from groups of varying economic status have about the same average innate intelligence. That is not saying there is nothing to heredity. It is saying rather that on the average the children from the different groups have about the same intelligence, but if they are raised with very restricted economic opportunity, as was the case among the 50 noncommercial farm families in the South, it is quite probable that they will have an I. Q. of 60 or 70 or 80. It is not primarily a question of the blood stream, though, of course, heredity is important, but fundamentally a question of economic status.

Under any system of mating we are likely to have among human beings, heredity as we usually think of it is unimportant in comparison with economic status. There is absolutely nothing to the idea that there are whole groups in the population that have no possibility of development. I cannot emphasize that too strongly. Give the children a chance. They are the hope of the future.

I am glad to be here, because if we see that the children are properly fed—and do not forget those vitamins of various kinds, the high-quality proteins, and all the rest of it—that they have an opportunity to absorb something in the way of proper home tradition and schooling, then we can be really proud of the children in all parts of the United States. That is the firm foundation of the future we are all working for.

The CHAIRMAN. I am extremely glad that the Secretary of Agriculture was willing to come tonight. It is a very great honor to have him participate with us in this conference, which I think and which I am sure he thinks is of tremendous social value to all the people of the United States.

This afternoon, as you know, the conference broke up into four sections for discussion of the major problems that are to be studied during the year ahead and the general methods of the work to be employed. They met for only 2 or 3 hours, and this evening we shall have brief reports of those section meetings, reports of progress as far as they have gone, by the chairmen of those meetings.

Dr. Plant, who is chairman of Section 1, on the Objectives of a Democratic Society in Relation to Children, will give the first report.

James S. Plant, M. D.

I opened the discussion with the statement that the problem of children in a democracy changes from year to year—that the matter before us was perhaps chiefly a restatement of the relationship of children to the structure within which they live. The situation of children in a democracy, on the basis of ever-changing economic and social conditions, demands a changing definition as each year brings new conditions.

The group in no sense accepted this view, the general point of view being that the democratic way of life is some more or less definite and fixed goal which any child can be indoctrinated into or taught to live or led toward—any term that you wish to use.

We developed in general two interests in the method of this indoctrination. These interests possibly reflect the personality pictures of the persons expressing them.

The first method of indoctrination is interpretative—a method in which you tell children about democracy, trying through the school, the church, the home, and various other agencies to teach by various techniques, this democratic way of living.

The second mode of indoctrination is that which involves the actual mode of adult living. One might say that we can indoctrinate by teaching children what we want them to believe or by showing children what we really believe.

Various technical matters involved in the first mode of indoctrination you will find spread through our minutes. As to the second mode, our group clustered its thinking around three topics.

1. There was some discussion as to the extent to which we must face those drifts in our democracy which are making it increasingly difficult to live in a democratic way (problems of urban concentration and of size of country as these affect our attitudes toward our own part in the venture and toward our fellow citizens).

2. There was considerable stress on the importance of creating for youth the opportunity for youth to live democratically. That is, it is not even safe to teach youth as to democracy if the opportunity to participate in a responsible way is not given to youth. If democracy demands emotional maturity, then through actual chances for responsible participation we must give youth an opportunity to achieve this maturity.

3. Finally, the group explored the extent to which the democratic way of living must come to the child through the faith, the courage and loyalty, the actual integrity of the lives of the adults who surround the child. This is not a matter of social machinery or of techniques of education; it is rather a matter of giving children belief in democracy because we ourselves have belief in democracy. We kept coming back to the need that exists that in the family, in

the school, in every part of our social pattern, we adults really have and believe in these values if we wish our children to retain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The second session today was on Economic Foundations of Family Life and Child Welfare. Mr. Hodson was the Chairman of that section, and I will ask him to report at this time.

William Hodson

We had an interesting and I think on the whole significant discussion this afternoon. We started out on the theory that what we were trying to do was to "evoke"—I think that is the technical word—all of the ideas that we could get out of a fine group of people who had had experience and background which justified them in commenting on the various subjects under discussion.

I would like first of all to give you the substance of a memorandum which we received as suggested agenda for discussion; then I should like to touch on the character of the discussion that ensued, and, finally, to give a brief summary of what seemed to me to be the highlights of that discussion.

The memorandum suggested that the following topics might come within the scope of the conference:

1. The distribution of child population and of income available for child care in the United States.
2. The family standards of living in urban and in rural homes.
3. Housing in relation to child welfare.
4. Community provisions for getting food to children whose families cannot provide them with adequate diets.
5. The possibilities of expanded social-insurance provisions through survivors' benefits for widows and children.
6. Measures for the relief of unemployment in relation to the welfare of children.
7. Public assistance and private relief to families with children in (a) normal homes and (b) broken homes.
8. Economic problems of special groups such as migrant families and of groups handicapped by race or nationality.

The second thing I would like to do, in order to be fair to those who participated in the discussion, is to run over quickly some of the high spots of the discussion. Dr. Falk gave us an interesting and significant summary of a study made by the Social Security Board on family income. There was some difference of opinion as to whether that study was an actual cross section of the families in the United States of America, but we agreed that it was not the purpose of our meeting to discuss the merits of the figures. The purpose of the meeting was rather to see what things ought to be put on the agenda for study during the coming year. Dr. Falk's study was brief but very stimulating indeed.

The next suggestion was that we ought to consider the strengthening of opportunities for trade unionism. Three or four times in the course of our discussion the point was raised that if we had strong labor unions they might have considerable influence in enlarging the purchasing power of the people of America. There was discussion of the problems of families in which a child has taken over the major support of the family, thus shortening the period of his childhood.

Then followed a consideration of housing and the variety of problems affecting the living conditions of our people. The matter of farm tenancy was also brought up. Some very interesting figures were presented with respect to farm tenancy and the question of whether people who did not own their farms were in a position to establish for themselves and their families that standard of living which American people ought to have.

There was good discussion of minority groups: the Negro, the Jew, and the migrant, among others. One suggestion was that we ought perhaps to have local committees that would undertake to do for their sections the kind of thing that we are doing here in Washington on a national basis.

The point was raised that there were many people who would perhaps never go back to work, and that we might as well face the fact that they would have to be cared for more or less permanently. We should, therefore, break down the prejudice which exists in many parts of the country concerning people who are not able to make their own living. In answer to this it was asserted that if we recognize that there are to be large numbers of people who will never work again for their own support, that is, in effect, a negation of democracy.

Those were the high points of the discussion which I will summarize briefly.

We all agreed, I think, that first of all we have people who are unable to work and have no purchasing power and therefore cannot provide the things for their families that those families need. Second, we have some people who are employable, who want to work but cannot, and they have no purchasing power. We also have some folks who are working, but at such low wages and salaries that they also cannot provide a decent standard of living.

We agreed that good housing and health and clothing and all the other necessities of life are, as a distinguished doctor once said regarding health, "purchasable," and that if people had income and could buy these things, we would not be in the position of discussing some of the tragic problems that face us today.

Our chief question was: How can we get at this question of income, of purchasing power, of making it possible for people to maintain and sustain themselves and their families? A further suggestion was made that perhaps we need to consider the prejudices and the misunderstandings of people throughout the country concerning the whole problem of unemployment, social security, WPA, and the rest, and that if we were wise enough in the coming year to recognize what those misunderstandings and what those prejudices are we might be able to develop the recommendations and report of the conference so as to enable us to make some distinct progress.

Finally, it was suggested that if we did not try to recommend too much, too many things that needed to be done, but would instead take a long-range view of many things that we would like to do in the next quarter of a century, and a very short view of a few things that need to be done tomorrow, and focus our attention on the latter points, we might all feel a greater sense of satisfaction at having accomplished something substantial.

In conclusion, I cannot sit down without reminding you of the famous comment which George Bernard Shaw made about youth, that youth was such a lovely, beautiful thing, it was a terrible thing to waste it on young people.

The CHAIRMAN. What Mr. Hodson has said brings forcibly to our attention what has been accomplished in the years since the first White House Conference took place. Some of the things that are among the assets of today can never be lost. I was delighted to hear that your committee made such progress.

You remember that the third section which met this afternoon was the section on the Development of Children and Youth in Present-Day American Life. Dr. Ruth Andrus was the chairman of that committee and will make the report tonight.

Ruth Andrus

The fundamental conclusion which our group reached was that the chief issue was to clear up the confusion in adults' minds in regard to democracy, so that children could be helped to live in a democratic way, because children would really be democratic if parents and other adults with whom they came in contact were themselves democratic.

One issue concerned the time dilemma in a democracy. How can we allow time for individual education and participation in group decisions and action and yet not develop a laissez-faire attitude? This time dilemma constitutes one of the basic differences between a dictatorship and a democracy.

There was also discussion of the sectionalism and smugness of youth, and that again was called a reflection of the adults' attitudes. So the question was raised: "Can community and can teacher education precede the education of youth so that the communities and the schools may help young people to overcome sectionalism?"

Other issues also centered particularly on adult-created situations. The point was made that the schools, which are run for the most part autocratically, are among the most important agencies for teaching democracy, and with what results for the children?

The next point was that the most serious issues are within the family itself—the radical changes which the family is undergoing, due to social and economic pressures, and the responsibilities in a democracy for family life, education, and family counseling.

I may say that some of the people who did not have an opportunity to express themselves during the discussion period were given an opportunity to make their contributions afterward. Some of those contributions form part of this report.

Another issue which begins with the family but spreads throughout the framework of our American life is the place of authority and discipline and the different attitudes with respect to them and their effect upon the development of children and youth. It was suggested that during the period since the last White House Conference some study has been made of the relative effects on the conduct of children of autocratic and democratic procedures, with their contrasting evaluations of the worth of the individual, and that one function of this conference might be to call upon various agencies—families, schools, youth organizations, and the like, to inventory the issues or dilemmas they present to children in terms of rules of conduct and codes. It might then be possible to assay the results of such codes on the lives and behavior of children in general as well as of such groups as rural youth.

Closely related to this was the suggestion that methods of coordinating the work of various organizations concerned with children and youth should be studied and recommendations made.

One speaker made the point that the obligations imposed by democracy need emphasis, and that instead of developing a children's charter this conference might well draw up a creed of mutual rights and responsibilities which both children and adults could adopt.

It was also pointed out that our democracy has its economic base in capitalism and that what we wish to do to guarantee security for our children might run "head-on" against the facts of the present economic system. The gentleman who raised this issue emphasized the fact that he himself was a capitalist and that he by no means

wished to be interpreted as suggesting socialism. But he thought that this limitation on our program was one that needed recognition.

Can we assign certain areas of economic endeavor to youth as their field of work? What effect will this have on the work situation for adults? What is the obligation of democracy to allow choice in these realms on the part of youth?

As a part of the economic discussion the issue was raised as to how nursery schools, health facilities, and the like are to be provided for all children. What is government's responsibility for these services? Are the resulting taxes to be shouldered in what might be called citizen budgeting, so that not only one's own children but the community's children are provided for in taxation?

The group recognized the responsibility of government for economic planning, to provide jobs and security for adults and youth. Another point discussed was the urgent need for dissemination of the facts brought out at the last White House Conference to the country at large in terms which the country at large can use and understand. It was recognized that there was a lag between scientific findings and the use of those findings by the man in the street to help in the development of children and youth.

Again, opportunities for children and youth to experience the democratic way of life depend on parents and teachers. How can teachers be educated, and if educated in the democratic way, how may they be permitted to demonstrate democracy and to exercise leadership in the communities where they teach and in the schools in which they are located?

Finally, the group charged the conference with developing a description of democracy which could be used as a basis for assaying the effect of present-day American life upon the growth and development of children and youth.

The CHAIRMAN. I can see that your group had a perfectly lovely afternoon. They discussed everything that most of us would like to discuss, and raised questions which I think most of us would like to debate right here and now.

We have another section, as you remember, the fourth section, which was devoted to the Child and Community Services for Health, Education, and Social Protection.

Mr. Frank Bane is the Chairman of that section and will report at this time.

Frank Bane

Much of our discussion this afternoon had to do with the progress which we have made over the past 40 years with respect to these problems, and the gaps that still exist in our services. All agreed, as many speakers said this morning, that we had made remarkable

progress with respect to education, with respect to health, and with respect to welfare services. All agreed at the same time that many gaps remain, that the distribution is very uneven, and that many communities in all parts of the country are not receiving now and have not received services to which they are entitled.

In the field of education, specifically, the oft-repeated slogan, "In this country a full school education for every child," was declared to be a snare and a delusion. It was stated that that slogan was honored more in the breach than in the general acceptance thereof.

It was also urged that our schools should take definite steps to teach American ideals and patriotism to the children.

It was likewise agreed that in the realm of public health there was a decided lag, particularly in the rural areas, with respect to general public-health activities and a decided lag almost everywhere with respect to medical care for underprivileged classes and for low-income groups.

I think it was agreed that although welfare services have generally been extended in recent years these services have not kept pace with current needs, and that the welfare program has not been planned carefully and constructively to meet the composite needs of our various communities; in fact, it was intimated that we had extended services for the aged at the expense, I might say, of the children.

It seemed to be the consensus of opinion—and you notice I assume all along that there was a consensus of opinion—that every effort should be made immediately to care for the needs which we already recognize. Several people were rather impatient with the idea that we should spend a year studying what we should do when everyone knew that we had need upon need in community after community that are not now being adequately met. Everyone thought that we should do everything possible to meet those needs and many persons thought that in addition to considering additional needs we should exert ourselves definitely and vigilantly to protect now, in this day and time, the gains which we have already made. Many thought that, in fact, the most important job now before us is to protect from general reaction the progress which we have made in the past 8 or 10 years.

However, it seemed to the entire group that this conference should carefully explore:

1. The scope of services for children in the various communities of this country.
2. The content of services that are now available to children.
3. The organization of the various institutions and agencies now charged with rendering services to children in our various communities.

4. The financing of adequate service for children in all of our communities.

5. The administration of these activities in our States and our various localities and also in the Federal Government, including specifically the type of personnel in administrative jobs dealing with these various services.

Our group felt that we should do these things to the end that adequate services in the fields of health, education, and welfare should be provided for all the children in all of the communities of the country. There seemed to be general agreement that this can be done only if all areas of government, local, State, and National, participate in the provision and in the supervision of these services, and that such cooperation at all levels of government is necessary if democratic government is to function for the benefit of all the people.

The CHAIRMAN. Excellent and significant statements were made today in the speeches by the President, Monsignor Keegan, Mr. Folks, and Mrs. Roosevelt. When Mr. Folks pointed out to us that the child who was going to be President in 1980, and the boys and girls who might be Governors and Congressmen and Senators about that time, were running around somewhere in this country in one kind of family or another, and that none of us knew who they might be and yet all of us standing there would perforce entrust the future destinies of our country to them, I thought that was an extraordinarily good figure to remind us of the importance of serving all of the children of the community as well as any generation knows how to serve its children. That will never desert me, that picture and that figure, and as I go traveling around the country, I shall see little presidents and little senators and little "governoresses" everywhere, and I don't know that I shall ever feel the same about children again. I think it is a good thing to be reminded all the time that here lies the destiny of all the future of the people of the United States in these little children, and that what they are will be the measure of what this great country becomes.

All this, I think, makes possible the kind of cooperative development of the best that is in people, and I am extremely grateful that I am privileged to be a part of the group that will for 1 year more try to bring into focus some of these realities and leave them in such form that those who come after us can never forget them.

Mr. Folks has during the day been gathering up new ideas for his report. I hope that all of you have told him what you thought were the most important items to be included in it. If you have missed your chance you can catch him as he leaves the audience hall tonight and pour into his ears your own bright ideas. It is out of that that he and the rest of us will be educated. Mr. Folks is going to discuss briefly now some of the plans for the development of the conference work.

Homer Folks

I am embarrassed to find myself now about to speak in behalf of the Report Committee. As you know, I am only the chairman of the committee. You have seen the committee members one by one, and how can I imagine what they will wish me to say when they meet tomorrow?

Dr. Plant, if I understood correctly his account of his section this afternoon, said that he had only to state his own views of what it should do, and all of those present promptly proceeded in the opposite direction.

I am sure that the Report Committee will be different in one respect at least from his section. They will not wait for the chairman to state his point of view before they proceed in all directions. Hence, I can only guess what the Report Committee will do, but I will indicate what it seems to me we are up against.

I know that one thing at least they would agree on, and that is that in no other group that could be brought together in this country at this time is there so much knowledge, experience, and wisdom in regard to what the children of this country need and what they are not getting, and where we should go from here, as there is in this present group.

To gather that experience and that knowledge into some unified form from a group of four hundred people, living in all the different States of the Union, is certainly not a simple process, and there is no established technique that I know of for getting the job done.

I was interested to recall one feature of the first conference. I remember well that we were a little disturbed as to how we would be able to elicit from it, in some useful and democratic way, the ideas of all those present on various phases of the particular subject. In the invitation issued to the members by the President, there was enclosed a draft of 14 questions which seemed to the Committee on Arrangements the outstanding questions in regard to dependent children. They were questions to be answered by "yes" or "no," and it was indicated that the program, when the people came together, would revolve around these questions. The idea would be to ascertain in 2 days the consensus of opinion of the group on those 14 very specific points. It worked out very well. But now this conference is of enormously wider scope. It deals not with one group of children, but with all children. It deals with them from a new point of view, the dynamic relationship between democratic types of life and the care of the children of the nation.

We have some idea how to make a start at it. As chairman of the Report Committee, I ask each of you, when you have returned to your respective homes and have given a bit of thought to what you have heard here and to what interpretation you place upon it, to write Miss Lenroot as to the particular subjects with which, in your opinion, we should deal in our report, and equally what particular subjects, if any, you think we should not deal with. It is clear from the reports of these four sections today that it is quite impossible for us, within the period of time available, to cover anything like the whole field. We cannot have our research people working and we cannot get our minds working efficiently until we delimit the boundaries of the subject matter with which we will undertake to deal.

That is item number one, and if you will be good enough to give us your respective opinions, after you have given the matter some thought, of what to deal with and what to leave out, your views will be given the most serious consideration. I cannot say to each individual, "Your views will be accepted," because many of them will be in conflict and we will have to do the best we can to elicit what seems to be as nearly as possible a consensus of opinion.

When we have succeeded as best we can in defining the area we are going to cover, we will have to proceed as best we can to find out the facts—the scientific facts, the ascertained facts, the administrative facts—in regard to each of those areas. We shall want not only what we call scientific facts, we shall also want the judgment of the lay people here, based on their wide experience, as to how these things can be secured, as to whether they can be secured. That is quite as important as to be right about our scientific facts.

In and of themselves, those facts are not going to get themselves accepted. They will have to be dealt with and brought together and marshaled in such a way that they will appeal to the people of the various States and localities of the country. We want your judgment on the practical side of how to get things done and of their relative importance, and, as Commissioner Hodson said, of relative chronology. I would suggest that you put your whole list of suggestions in chronological form; at least, first things first and second things second and third things third.

If we try to do it all, the country will have indigestion. If we indicate no choices, nothing will happen at all. The criterion of our success is going to be how well we can frame our program so that the people of the country will understand what we are talking about and will say, "That is it, that is what we want, that's putting it right, now let's have it."

We want very much the consensus of your mature thought.

We hope you will take pains to inform yourselves. I want to ask every one of you that has not done so to read two books¹—short, simple, and nicely printed, and very easily read—both because of the sheer pleasure of the style in which they are written and because of the great wisdom, knowledge, and information that is thereby brought to focus in a very brief space and in words almost of one syllable.

One is a little volume by Dr. Carr—it is not signed by him but his committee says that he did it—and it is a marvelous piece of work. It is concerned with the purposes of education in a democracy. It is grand reading. It is wonderful to get that statement by that group so well put.

The other is the summary report of the study by the Board of Regents of education in New York State. It comes right down to exactly what in the opinion of that group after a long study are the things we now should do next.

To my mind, the New York report is almost a perfect instance of what a good report of a study can be.

Let us all pull together. We are widely scattered, but we shall be united in purpose, united in thought. If we put our heads together we can say something and start something that will benefit the children of this country more than any of us can now foresee.

I want to give you one quotation, and I want each of you to make a personal application of it. I recently read the biography of Elihu Root. He, you remember, was Secretary of War for several years, after which he retired to private life. Then he was offered by President Roosevelt the post of Secretary of State to succeed John Hay. It was made known publicly that he had received the offer. He was already being talked about very prominently as the next candidate for the presidency if he would run.

A client of his, head of a great railway company, wired him: "Would it not be better to wait three years for the substance rather than to take the shadow now?" And Mr. Root replied: "My feeling is that the opportunities that come to us to do things are substance, and the things we try to get for ourselves are shadows."

Members of the conference, you have your opportunity to do things.

The CHAIRMAN. We have come to the end of a very full day in which many of us have had a revival of spirit and interest in the objectives of American society, and I think that we are going in this

¹ Educational Policies Commission: The Purposes of Education in American Democracy. The commission, 1201 16th St. NW., Washington. 1937. 157 pp. 50 cents.

Regents' Inquiry Into the Character and Cost of Public Education in the State of New York: Education for American Life. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. 1938. 167 pp. \$2.

year of study and interchange of views to define, to redefine in simple terms, the objectives of a living society in the United States of America.

We have taken a great deal of our life for granted and have not given sufficient attention to a standard or formula which we could hold up to each child in school and say, "See, this is what it means to be in America. Try to be like that and you will be sure that you are serving a useful purpose in your community." I am not sure that, in recent years, we have even included the word "useful" in the definition of what constitutes an American way of living. But we cannot develop the thought that has begun to grow in this conference, develop it truly and honestly, without coming to look at personal as well as social life. We must find out for ourselves what constitute the permanent values in life.

If we are thinking of children as creatures endowed with responsibility as well as creatures for whom we will do much while they are young—as obviously we are—we are thinking in terms of purpose and direction of life, and we are bound to begin to define again what are the objectives and purposes of living in the United States of America.

What does it mean to be an American? What is required of an American?

In my part of the country, when someone asked us to do something that we had been taught was not quite right, we used to say, "Why, people don't do such things."

That phrase came to be something to laugh at. Ibsen made a play about it, and one of my first awakenings into the great modern world was the realization that one could laugh at that phrase and that it might not be a binding, inhibiting phrase to say to people, "You mustn't do that because people don't do such things."

Nevertheless, in my mature age I find that I rest comfortably on the idea that "people don't do such things." What I mean is, of course, that there are some things that I would not do and that you would not do.

We in the United States are the kind of people who trust each other not to do "low-down" things. We have come to realize that a rule of behavior, a simple rule of life, is one of the things that will give stability to American life. From defining the responsibilities of a democracy to its children and the responsibility of young persons to the democratic society in which they live, from the attempt to describe that reality of relationship, there may come a new and simple rule of life, so that we can say confidently, "Americans do not do that sort of thing" or "You can count on Americans to do this sort of thing."

Then people will be proud to do certain generous and fine and unselfish things, because they are Americans living in a democratic society, in a society of freedom and mutual confidence, and because they want their freedom and so are glad to make some sacrifice in order that others may have freedom too. Because they all have freedom, they want to be sure that that freedom is used constructively and creatively and for purposes that we all recognize as good, not

purposes that are chaotic and destructive. The service of children to the state is not what we have been thinking of in all these days when we have been developing an American character upon this continent. We regard the state and the officers of the state as servants of the people. We regard government itself as an instrument through which free people may cooperate with each other for the accomplishment of a good end—a socially good end and a personally good end.

As we come to put these thoughts into words, perhaps we shall have courage enough and insight enough—after we have recommended and pointed the way for the development of an economic life sufficient to sustain all the children of the country and give them the opportunity to have good health and good minds, and after we have provided schooling, physical education, and spiritual as well as intellectual education, and after we have provided for medical attention to the problems of health, and for the proper psychiatric attention to the problems of distorted personalities—perhaps then we shall have courage and wisdom enough to see that in going back to the old-fashioned ideas, or in going back to church and Sunday school, may lie a part of the recommendation that we want to make with regard to the future of the children of the United States of America. Some of the simple practices and habits that stood by our parents and grandparents and stood by many of us will, perhaps, stand by our children.

I place great hope in the report that will be prepared by this conference. I have great hope that it will be simple, that it will be direct, and that it will take account of all the things that we know as men and women quite as much as of those things that we know because we are students of social phenomena. The people of this country trust us to write a document which we sincerely believe and which those who come after us may follow for many days to come.

